

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02870 9780



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2006 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# The Teaching of The Gospel of John

By

J. RITCHIE SMITH

8293

*Minister of Market Square Presbyterian Church,  
Harrisburg, Pa.*



NEW YORK

CHICAGO

TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

BS  
2615  
Sm5

Copyright, 1903, by  
**FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY**  
(March)



New York: 158 Fifth Avenue  
Chicago: 63 Washington Street  
Toronto: 27 Richmond Street, W  
London: 21 Paternoster Square  
Edinburgh: 30 St. Mary Street

45203820 V

## Contents

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	7
I. RELATION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT . . . . .	21
II. THE DOCTRINE OF GOD . . . . .	54
III. THE WORD—HIS NATURE . . . . .	84
IV. THE WORD—HIS EARTHLY MISSION . . . . .	105
V. THE WORD—HIS HEAVENLY MINISTRY . . . . .	142
VI. THE HOLY SPIRIT . . . . .	157
VII. THE DOCTRINE OF SIN . . . . .	183
VIII. SALVATION . . . . .	221
IX. THE NEW LIFE . . . . .	252
X. THE CHURCH . . . . .	288
XI. THE END OF ALL THINGS . . . . .	324
XII. JOHN AND PAUL COMPARED . . . . .	366



## INTRODUCTION

IT is the purpose of this volume to set forth the teaching of the Gospel that bears the name of John. The Epistles, though not directly included within the scope of the work, have been freely drawn upon; but no complete exposition of them has been attempted. The Apocalypse is so different in style and subject-matter that it demands separate treatment, and has served only by way of occasional illustration.

Questions which pertain to introduction are not strictly germane to our purpose, which is purely exegetical and expository, concerned only with the analysis and exhibition of the material that the Gospel presents, from whatever sources that material has been derived. Yet the authorship and the trustworthiness of the record are matters of such importance that they cannot be passed over without at least a word to indicate the point of view from which they are regarded in the study upon which we are about to enter.

It is assumed that the Gospel is the work of the beloved disciple. This is amply attested by the voice of history, as is sufficiently shown, for example, by Prof. Ezra Abbot in his "*Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*," is confirmed by the

witness of the book itself, as is shown, with abundant reference to authorities, in the article "*John, Gospel of,*" in Hastings' Bible Dictionary; and however vigorously it is denied, may be regarded as one of the assured results of Biblical criticism.

But the question remains, If the Gospel is the work of John, is it trustworthy? Is it veritable history, or the tender reveries of an old man, dreaming of days long past as the shadows of the evening gather about him, and mingling fact and fancy as men do in dreams?

Neither space nor purpose permits detailed discussion; we must be content to indicate the course of the argument by which the trustworthiness of the record may be established.

The main objection is drawn from the difference between the teaching of Jesus in this Gospel and that preserved by the earlier evangelists. The contrast is marked alike in matter and in method, as is noted in chapter four. In the earlier Gospels he speaks of the kingdom of heaven, or of God, here he speaks of himself. There he taught ordinarily in parable, here in long and elaborate discourse. His words there are of a popular and practical character, here they are mystical and profound. But each of the Gospels represents only a fragment of the most highly endowed and many-sided life that ever appeared on earth. In the course of the

exposition many points of contact between the Synoptists and John will be discovered. They sometimes strike the note of John, as in Matt. 11:25-30 and Luke 10:21, 22; and John records sayings of Jesus analogous to those of the other Gospels. The parable, which is a truth translated from thought to life, is here in germ. If it may thus be shown that beneath the apparent discrepancies an underlying harmony prevails, the very diversity between the evangelists argues in favor of the accuracy of John. As his Gospel was the latest of the four, he must have been familiar with the earlier Gospels, or with the sources from which they drew, and with the portraiture of Jesus which they had made familiar. How could he venture to publish a representation so different from that which had already been given to the church and to the world unless he was assured that it was true? And how could the church receive a Gospel so broadly contrasted with those which had gone before, unless convinced that it came from one who was entitled to speak with authority? Both representations were received by the church from the beginning; and however lightly we may esteem the critical acumen of the early church, its historical witness cannot be set aside.

It is objected again that the discourses of the Gospel, whether it is Jesus who speaks, or John the Baptist, or the evangelist, are all in the same

uniform style, which is also the style of the First Epistle ascribed to John. Evidently they were all fashioned by the same hand.

The general similarity of style is manifest. It may be remarked that if Jesus spoke in Aramaic,<sup>1</sup> His discourses are preserved not in their original form but in a translation; that they may be given not in full but only in outline; and further, that it cannot be determined how far the style of John may have been moulded by that of Jesus. Moreover, there are indications that John carefully refrained from putting his own words into the mouth of his Master. It is especially noteworthy that the term *Logos*, which dominates the prologue, nowhere occurs in the discourses of Jesus, even where the occasion seemed to invite it (10: 35). The claim that the world was made by Him (1: 10) is never ascribed to Jesus, though at times it appeared almost inevitable (17: 5). Sayings which at the time were not understood are preserved in their original enigmatic form (2: 19-21; 7: 38, 39; 12: 32, 33).

If again the monotony of the Gospel be urged, it is true that the theme is one throughout, but it is presented in a variety of forms, and always in the form which the occasion naturally suggested. To the multitude that He had fed He represented Himself as the Bread of Life (6); at the feast of tabernacles, which was celebrated by

<sup>1</sup> See Dalman's *Words of Jesus*—Introduction.

daily libations of water drawn from the pool of Siloam, as Living Water (7: 37; comp. 4: 10 ff.); to the Jews who boasted of their descent from Abraham, as Abraham's Lord (8: 53-58); when He was about to heal the blind man, as Light (9: 5); in contrast to the rulers who had cast out the blind man healed, as the Good Shepherd (10); to Martha at the death of Lazarus, as the Resurrection and the Life (11: 25); to His disciples contending for the first place in His kingdom, as an example of humility (13), and to them in their perplexity, as the Way and the Truth (14: 6).

If further objection be drawn from the difficulty of reproducing these long and profound discourses after the lapse of more than half a century, it may readily be supposed that John had not only pondered the words of Jesus in his heart throughout those years, but had often repeated them in oral teaching before he committed them to writing.

To these considerations add the promised guidance of the Spirit, and there is sufficient reason to believe that the teaching of Jesus has been reported, if not with literal exactness, yet with substantial accuracy in the pages of the Fourth Gospel.

The Bible is on the one side the record of a divine revelation, on the other side a transcript of human experience. God speaks to men

through men. The freshness and power of the teaching of Scripture lies in no mean measure in the fact that it is conveyed in terms of personal experience. Divine truth is reinforced by human sympathy. It is presented not in the form of abstract proposition, but in immediate relation to life, speaks from the heart to the heart. One of the difficulties indeed that confronts the expositor is the necessity of turning the concrete into the abstract, deducing the general from the particular, translating terms of experience into terms of doctrine. This is only to say, of course, that theology is related to Scripture as science to nature. Every man delivers his message in his own way according to his individual character and experience, and all are moved by the Holy Spirit; as every key of the organ has its proper and peculiar tone, yet one hand presses them all, and weaves together in swelling harmony their varied notes.

John was fitly chosen to portray the profoundest aspects of the life and teaching of his Master. He was probably a cousin of Jesus and perhaps acquainted with Him from childhood. He became the most intimate of His friends, distinguished by the title, *the disciple whom Jesus loved*. The name *Boanerges, sons of thunder*, given to him and his brother, pointed to the ardent temperament, the fiery zeal, which perhaps hurried James to an early death. In John

it betokened a vehemence which betrayed itself rather in speech than in action. The roll of thunder is heard throughout the Apocalypse, and forms the deep undertone of the Gospel. This flaming ardor, tempered by fellowship with Jesus and hallowed by the Spirit, gave birth in old age to the Gospel that brings us nearest to the heart of Jesus, the heart that burns with infinite hatred of sin and infinite love for the sinner.

It is a fine saying of Grotius that what Alexander the Great used to say of his friends, that one of them loved Alexander and the other loved the king, may be applied to Peter and John. Peter loved most the Christ, and John loved Jesus; wherefore Jesus committed the church to Peter and his mother to John.<sup>1</sup> As the Son lay in the bosom of the Father, so John lay in the bosom of the Son; as the Son declared the Father, so John declares the Son. John was of all men most thoroughly qualified at once by congeniality of spirit and by opportunity to tell the story of his Master.

To John Jesus entrusted His mother, and he took her to his own home. She remained with him, no doubt, until her death. Thus Jesus drew together those whom of all on earth, we may believe, He loved most tenderly, and by whom in turn He was most tenderly beloved.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the remarks of Thos. Aquinas on the relation of Peter and John to Jesus (I. 20. 4).

How often the mother and the friend must have communed together, recalled the memories of the past, until their hearts held no secrets from each other. There are those who make much of the influence of Philo and Paul upon the Gospel; let not Mary the mother of Jesus be forgotten. The hand of a mother bore a part in tracing the portrait of Jesus that is signed with the name of John.

If love and sympathy are the best interpreters, no life besides was ever so faithfully and intimately portrayed.

In our study of the Gospel the words of the evangelist and of Jesus are both included. Jesus spoke through John. Unlike the earlier Gospels the narrative is interwoven with the comments of the evangelist, so that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the words of the speaker from the reflections of the writer. John nowhere names himself, but it is evident that he maintains his reserve with difficulty, and as the story draws to a close he can restrain himself no longer, and comes forward to bear his personal witness. Here it is of interest to note the proportion of the words of Jesus to the contents of the several Gospels.

	Total no. of lines.	Words of Jesus-lines.
Matthew	2,220	1,206
Mark	1,345	458
Luke	2,376	1,085
John	1,749	692

The proportion is largest in Matthew, next in Luke, then in John. It is evidently not true, as is sometimes asserted, that the earlier Gospels are concerned rather with the works and John with the words of Jesus. Godet aptly remarks upon "the preponderance of the didactic over the narrative element" in Matthew: "more than half of the book contains discourses and conversations. And this preference does not appear only in the whole of the recital, but also in the way in which the particular features are related. . . . There is constantly one thesis at the basis of the first Gospel, which approximates it to the fourth, and distinguishes it from the two other Synoptics. This thesis is the Messianic dignity of Jesus" (*Introd. N. T.* 2: 1, pp. 167, 168).

Our study is concerned with the works of Jesus as well as with His words, else, as the analysis just given shows, three-fifths of the material of the Gospel is not utilized. A miracle is a sign, conveys a lesson as truly as a sermon. Jesus taught by His life as well as by His lips, and every incident is significant as a revelation of His unchanging nature. The peculiar value of His words, indeed, lies in the fact that they disclose His character and interpret His life.

In this Gospel beyond any other portion of the New Testament we are conscious that the mind plays merely upon the surface of the truth.

Thought so profound wedded to language so simple is found nowhere besides. Elsewhere we are engaged in tracing the logical sequence of the argument, unravelling intricacies of style, investigating the force of words; here it is the thought alone that engages us. The language is transparently simple, and we gaze into these limpid depths as into the blue heavens, where there are no limits to vision but such as the eye itself imposes. The words are clear as crystal, but the thought is deep as the heart of God. Consider for example the prologue of the Gospel. In these few verses the nature of God, Trinity in Unity; His relation to the world which He has made, and to man as fallen and as redeemed, under the old covenant and the new, are set forth with matchless clearness and power. The fundamental truths of creation, providence and redemption have here a place. Such range and variety in so narrow compass has no parallel in literature—the unfolding of the divine purpose from its origin in the depths of eternity to its fulfilment in the incarnation of the Word, the nature and extent of the divine revelation in all the various forms in which it has been granted to man, culminating in the grace and truth of Jesus Christ—all this compressed within fewer words than are employed elsewhere in Scripture to relate a single miracle.

## LITERATURE

The Revised Version is ordinarily used, and the text of Westcott and Hort. In general only books accessible to the English reader are cited, and if quotations are drawn from other tongues they are accompanied by a translation. No formal bibliography has been prepared, but in each chapter sufficient references are given to guide the student in further inquiry. Among modern commentaries those of Meyer, Godet, and Westcott have proved most helpful. In the combination of ample learning, exegetical tact, and spiritual insight the work of Godet if equalled has never been surpassed. The excellent volume of Prof. George B. Stevens on "*The Johannine Theology*" serves to remove the reproach it brings that "no treatise which purports to furnish a critical and systematic presentation of the theology of John has hitherto been composed in English." Among recent works Mr. Lowrie's "*Doctrine of St. John*" will not be overlooked by the student.

The precise and formal logic of Thomas Aquinas is often cited. His "*Summa*" is marvelously ingenious and subtle, and no student of the history of thought can afford to remain ignorant of this masterpiece of scholastic theology.

But of all writers of earlier or of later times there is none besides whom I have found so stimulating and suggestive as Augustine.<sup>1</sup> Though

<sup>1</sup> See my article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1904, "*Augustine as an Exegete*."

his exegetical equipment was imperfect, and his learning rather varied than profound, such is the range and subtlety of his thought, the vigor of his style, the keenness of his insight, the sweep of his imagination, the fervor of his devotion, that he must be pronounced the most fruitful and inspiring expositor in the history of the church. His place is among the foremost thinkers of the world, and no other man has ever wielded such imperial sway in any realm of thought, not even Aristotle or Plato, as the great Latin father in theology. It is a remarkable evidence of the versatility of his genius that while he has developed with marvellous force and precision the legal system of Paul, he has entered with equal sympathy into the mystical teaching of John; nor is it easy to determine whether he is more at home with the scholastics or the mystics. In this regard he is far superior to his great pupil, Calvin. This I say having just completed a careful reading of the *Institutes*. Calvin surpasses his master in learning, in critical power, in sobriety of judgment; but we miss in him the breadth of view, the flashes of insight, the magnificent play of the imagination, that constantly allure us in the pages of Augustine. Augustine therefore perpetually invites, or rather provokes, quotation, as Calvin does not.

It is true indeed that in that wondrously fertile soil the weeds too grow rank, and it is not too

much to say that apart from the fundamental principles which they hold in common Protestantism is built upon the truth and Roman Catholicism upon the error of his system. Yet with all his defects he may be pronounced the greatest thinker of the Christian church since the days of the apostles.

There is always danger that the voices of commentators and critics drown the voice of the evangelist. Where so much has been written, and nobly written, it is difficult to confine quotation within reasonable limits ; and the temptation to turn aside for the purpose of refuting erroneous views presents itself at every step. We are easily drawn away from the study of John to the study of what has been said about John, so that the Gospel is dealt with rather at second-hand, examined through the medium of opinion and controversy rather than with open vision. I have constantly sought to guard against this peril, but only they who are engaged in similar work know how insidious it is, and how easily and unconsciously we are overcome by it.

I have made use of several articles of my own that have appeared in various theological reviews.

It is hoped that this volume, while not wholly unworthy the attention of scholars, may be found peculiarly adapted to the needs of those who without the training or facilities required for

thorough independent study yet desire a more intimate acquaintance with the Word. With this class of readers particularly in view, I have not hesitated to transgress the limits which a strictly scientific method might impose, and draw upon the general teaching of the New Testament, where it seemed necessary to complete the thought of John, as in the chapter on *Sin*; and even to venture upon the debatable ground of ecclesiastical history, as in the chapter on the *Church*.

It remains that I tender grateful thanks to my friend and classmate, Prof. B. B. Warfield, of Princeton Theological Seminary, Prof. Henry van Dyke, of Princeton University, Pres. George B. Stewart, of Auburn Theological Seminary, and my father, for kindly encouragement and helpful criticism.

# I

## RELATION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

EDUCATION is based upon primary truths, first principles. Axioms lie at the root of all our thinking. To prove we must first assume. The ultimate premises of logic are intuitions. There is something surer than logic, or logic would be an endless chain. However extended the demonstration, it begins with an assumption which can neither be proved nor denied. There must be common ground on which teacher and pupil may meet, an authority to which both alike submit. If these are wanting, to teach is to beat the air. The knowledge of the pupil forms the point of departure for the instruction of the teacher, the old furnishes the basis for the new.

In the case of the heathen the New Testament finds this common ground, this final authority, in the religion of nature, the revelation of God in His works, especially in the constitution of man. This lay at the foundation of Paul's discourse to the men of Athens (Acts 17: 22 ff. Comp. Acts 14: 17), and he dwells upon it at length in the opening of his Epistle to the Romans. John affirms that the Word of God is the light

22 The Teaching of the Gospel of John  
of men from the beginning. The true light lighteth every man.

In the case of the Jews the New Testament appeals to the Old. The truth of natural religion is all contained in clearer form in the Scripture, and the Old Testament is related to the religion of nature as the New Testament to the Old; with this difference, that all the teaching of the New Testament is implicitly and germinally comprehended in the old, while the central truth of the Old Testament, the promise of the Savior, has no place in the religion of nature. The law is written on the hearts of men, but not the gospel. Thus in the case of the heathen and the Jew alike a prior law is invoked; each new revelation must attach itself to the revelation that has gone before. The Old Testament at once supersedes the religion of nature, and prepares the way for the gospel.

No portion of the New Testament is more thoroughly pervaded by the spirit of the Old Scripture than the Gospel of John. Stronger witness could not be borne to the enduring value and authority of the Word; for it is characteristic of this Gospel, as we shall see, that beyond any other of the New Testament writings it portrays the religion of Christ in its original and essential form, divorced from all that is incidental and occasional. The old revelation is enshrined in the very heart of the new.

Throughout the Gospel the Old Testament is recognized by all parties as the Word of God, the supreme rule of faith and life. The controversy between Jesus and the Jews turned upon the Scripture, but there was no difference of opinion regarding its inspiration and authority. The question at issue was simply the *interpretation* of the Word. It is God who speaks. "God spake to Moses," said the Pharisees (9: 29); "If He (God) called them gods," said Jesus (10: 35). Each of the three divisions of the Scripture (Luke 24: 44) is cited by Jesus—the law (5: 46; 7: 19, 23), the prophets (6: 45), the Psalms (10: 34; 15: 25). It should be observed that *the law* is sometimes used broadly, as elsewhere in the New Testament (1 Cor. 14: 21), to cover all portions of the Old Testament (10: 34; 12: 34; 15: 25). That the Scripture cannot be broken (10: 35) was the major premise of every argument.

There is frequent allusion to the facts of Old Testament history—the law given by Moses (1: 17; 7: 19); Jacob's ladder (1: 51); the ground that Jacob gave to Joseph (4: 5, 12); the manna (6: 32, 49); the patriarchal rite of circumcision (7: 22); the Jews are the seed of Abraham (8: 37); the devil is a murderer and a liar from the beginning (8: 44). The opening of the Gospel—"In the beginning"—answers to the opening of the law. John the Baptist unites

## 24 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

the old covenant and the new, greater than the greatest of the old, less than the least of the new (Matt. 11: 11). The Jews are regarded as the people of God. "Salvation is from the Jews" (4: 22). To them was given the promise of the Christ, of them the Christ was born. The Word came to the Jews as *His own* (1: 11), and the gospel like the law was addressed primarily to them. At the birth of Jesus the angel brought glad tidings to all *the (Jewish) people* (Luke 2: 10); John the Baptist came baptizing with water that the Messiah might be made manifest to *Israel* (1: 31); *Israelite indeed* is a title of honor (1: 47). Jesus was recognized as a Jew (4: 9), called Himself a Jew (4: 22), was crucified as a Jew (18: 35; 19: 19), and buried as a Jew (19: 40).

The historic setting of the Gospel is therefore thoroughly Jewish. There is constant allusion to Jewish customs and modes of thought, and we breathe the air of the Old Testament. The Gospel is drawn upon the background of the law. In the synoptic narrative Jesus crossed the borders of the Holy Land once, and once only (Matt. 15: 21; Mark 7: 24, 31); so far as John records, His life was spent wholly within the bounds of Palestine, and His ministry was confined to the Jews, except in the case of the Samaritans, through whose country He was compelled to pass, though He remained there only

two days (4: 40); and of the Greek proselytes, who sought to see Him at the feast (12: 20), if, as is probable, He granted their request. The Gospel has no points of contact with secular history except those which the progress of the narrative requires.

Moreover the scene of His ministry is laid chiefly in Judea, partly in order to supplement the synoptic record, and partly because there the spirit of Judaism was most intense and the opposition to Him most bitter, and there the decisive struggle took place. He visited every part of Palestine, indeed, and was often in Galilee. There His first miracle was wrought, after which He abode in Capernaum not many days (2: 12). There He healed the nobleman's son (4: 46). By the sea of Tiberias He fed the multitude, and discoursed upon the bread of life in the synagogue of Capernaum (6). The words of His brethren upon the eve of His final departure from Galilee (7: 3, 4), six months before His death, intimate that for some time He had manifested Himself chiefly in the northern province, while they considered Judea the proper theatre of a prophet's labors. He was therefore commonly regarded as a Galilean (1: 45, 46; 7: 41, 52; 18: 5, 7; 19: 19; Luke 23: 5, 7). *Samaritan* (8: 48) is of course simply a term of reproach. "*His own country*" (4: 44) is not Judea, but Galilee. The prophet must win honors abroad if he would

## 26 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

wear them at home, and Jesus was received by the Galileans because they had "seen all things that He did in Jerusalem." In the earlier Gospels *His own country* is always Nazareth (Matt. 13: 54; Mark 6: 1, 4; Luke 4: 23, 24). By the sea of Tiberias He manifested Himself to His disciples after He rose from the dead (21).

Yet Judea, and particularly Jerusalem, is the scene of about three-fourths of the narrative. After His baptism Jesus went to Galilee, because He would not inaugurate His Messianic ministry in Jerusalem until the passover. Subsequently it appears that He never left Judea except to escape the malice of the Jews. There He remained from the passover (2: 13) to December (4: 35), a period of about eight months; and then returned to Galilee because the Pharisees were disturbed by the report that He was making and baptizing more disciples than John (4: 1). This journey Matthew (4: 12) and Mark (1: 14) connect with the imprisonment of John. When John was out of the way, the rulers were free to turn their attention to Jesus. In chapter five He came again to Jerusalem, but the Jews sought to kill Him, and chapter six finds Him again in Galilee. Once more He visited Jerusalem to attend the feast of tabernacles (7: 2), and remained there three months, until the feast of dedication (10: 22); was driven out by the hostility of the Jews (10: 39), and went to Bethany beyond Jor-

dan (10: 40). And finally after the raising of Lazarus He was compelled to withdraw from the vicinity of Jerusalem to Ephraim, a city of Judea (11: 54), where He remained until He came to Bethany, six days before the Passover. From this review it appears that Jerusalem was His chosen field of labor, and that He turned to Galilee because He was driven out of Judea. "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her: how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, and ye would not!" (Luke 13: 33, 34).

If the feast of 5: 1 was Purim, the period covered by the Judean ministry is a little more than a year—from the first passover to December, eight months; from Purim to the second passover, one month, of which a part may have been spent in Judea, as John does not tell us when He withdrew to Galilee; from the feast of tabernacles to the feast of dedication, three months; and the closing four months of His life were spent in Perea, Bethany, Ephraim, and Jerusalem. If the feast of 5: 1 was the passover, a year must be added to His life, of which a part may have been spent in Judea. In either case, His ministry was not unequally divided between the northern and southern provinces. The earlier

## 28 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

Gospels record chiefly His work in Galilee, and John His work in Judea.

But while the Jews are thus recognized as historically the people of God, it is also taught that by their sins, and especially by their rejection of the Messiah, they have forfeited their birthright. They are the seed of Abraham after the flesh, but not after the spirit (8 : 37, 39). They boast that they are Moses' disciples (9 : 28), but he shall accuse them of unbelief (5 : 45). They do not know God (8 : 55), though they call Him their Father (8 : 41). They have the Word of God but it does not abide in them (5 : 38), and they do not hear His words (8 : 47). "My word hath not full course in you," though "I speak the things which I have seen with My Father," and "tell you the truth, which I heard from God" (8 : 37, 38, 40). They search the Scriptures, but will not come to Him of whom the Scriptures witness (5 : 39, 40). They are no longer separate from the world, but part of it, for Jesus says of His disciples, all Jews, that they are called out of the world (17 : 6); and to the Jews He said, "Ye are of this world" (8 : 23). Mankind is not now divided between Jews and Gentiles, but between believers and the world. *His own* (1 : 11) are no longer the Jews but believers (13 : 1). John therefore, writing when the separation of Christianity from Judaism was complete, rarely employs the term *the Jews* in the simple historical

sense. Ordinarily it conveys the thought of alienation and antagonism. The Jews have assumed towards the kingdom of God the position which the Gentiles held before (Eph. 2: 11, 12, 19; Col. 1: 21). Usually, although not invariably, the term is restricted to the Judeans, and designates the people, and especially their leaders, in their opposition to Jesus. There were those who doubted and those who believed among the Jews, even among their rulers (9: 16, 12: 42), but as a whole they remained in unbelief. The phrase is used four times by Jesus (4: 22; 13: 33; 18: 20, 36); in the first instance in a favorable sense, elsewhere with at least a suggestion of the sense in which it is commonly employed by the Evangelist. In the earlier Gospels, beyond the title KING OF THE JEWS, the phrase occurs only in Matt. 28: 15; Mark 7: 3; Luke 7: 3; 23: 51, and in Matthew and Mark there is an approximation to the usage of John.

In this regard John is contrasted with Paul, who lost no opportunity to assert his Jewish birth, and his love for his kinsmen according to the flesh. Yet in Gal. 4: 3, 9, he places Jewish ordinances, though divinely given, upon a level with the rites of heathen worship as weak and beggarly elements of the world. They were of value only as preparatory to the gospel, and when perverted from their true intent and re-

## 30 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

garded as sufficient in themselves, they became, as the prophets taught, a stumbling-block in the way of men, and an offense to God.

Among the Jews the Pharisees and the Sadducees are distinguished. Neither scribes nor Sadducees are named in the Gospel, but the scribes were usually Pharisees, though not always (Acts 23:9), and were the leaders of the Pharisaic party; while the high priest and the chief priests were Sadducees. They were united in their hostility to Jesus. The Sadducees assume greater prominence as the plot unfolds. It is Caiaphas, the high priest, who gives counsel and takes the lead (11:49), while the Pharisees are irresolute (12:19). The chief priests are the leading actors in the closing scenes of the Gospel, and the guilt of the crucifixion is imputed particularly to them. Together with the Pharisees they conspired with Judas (18:3); they for envy delivered Jesus (Mark 15:10); they incited the people to demand that He should be crucified (19:6). "Thine own nation and the chief priests delivered thee" (18:35); "He that delivered me unto thee"—the high priest as the representative of the nation—"hath the greater sin" (19:11). They asked that the title set over the cross might be changed (19:21); with the Pharisees they set a guard at the sepulchre (Matt. 27:62); they finally rejected the Messianic hope with the words, "We have

no king but Cæsar" (19: 15); they spread the false report that His disciples stole His body while the soldiers slept (Matt. 28: 12, 13).

Over against *the Jews* stands *the multitude*—in 12: 9 δ ὁλός πολύς, *the common people*. The term designates either the crowd gathered upon a particular occasion, or the populace, Galilean or Judean, in distinction from the ruling classes. The multitude was uncertain, fluctuating, sensuous, slow of understanding, at times hearing Jesus gladly, but easily swayed by their rulers (Matt. 27: 20, 25; Mark 15: 11).

The attitude of Jesus towards the law is clearly marked. The moral law remains in force, broadened and spiritualized, and men shall be judged according to their works (5: 29). He enforced the distinction drawn by the prophets between the ceremonial and the moral law (1 Sam. 15: 22; Isa. 1: 10-17; Jer. 7: 21-23; Amos 5: 21ff; Micah 6: 6ff. See Oehler, *O. T. Theol.*, §§ 84 and 201; Schultz, *O. T. Theol.*, 2, ch. 4. Smith on Twelve Prophets, 1: 156ff. On the teaching of Jesus see Matt. 9: 13; 12: 7; 23: 23; Luke 10: 27). Following Weiss (*N. T. Theol.*, § 24c, § 71c 3), Professor Stevens strangely affirms that "this distinction"—between the ceremonial and the moral portions of the law—"is recognized neither in the Old Testament nor in the New" (*N. T. Theol.*, p. 24, note); while he is himself compelled to admit "that Jesus set an entirely second-

## 32 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

ary value upon the ceremonial law" (id. p. 107. Compare Beyschlag, *N. T. Theol.*, 1:1, ch. 5, § 3). If indeed Jesus placed the ritual and the moral on the same level, His teaching would be distinctly inferior to that of the prophets. He taught that the temple worship, the centre of the ceremonial system, should be abrogated. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth" (4: 23). A spiritual dispensation has been inaugurated which shall effect the abolition of the old law of worship. The moral law prescribes worship, the ceremonial law prescribes the place of worship. Henceforth not a holy place but a holy heart is required. Not the temple in Jerusalem or Mount Gerizim is the true sanctuary, but the soul of man. "Wouldest thou pray in a temple? Pray in thyself. But be thou first a temple of God, for He in His temple heareth him that prays" (Augustine. Comp. 1 Cor. 3:17; 6:19; Eph. 2:21, 22; 1 Peter 2:5; Mal. 1:11). If the ceremonial must yield to the moral law, and if the one is to pass away while the other endures, it is hard to see how a distinction could be more clearly drawn. Jesus and the Jews renewed the battle of the prophet and the priest. Ritual is religion, said the priest; righteousness is religion, said the prophet. It is the uniform teaching of Scripture that ritual as the expression of righteousness is

accepted, ritual as the substitute for righteousness is condemned. An impressive illustration of the priestly maxim is furnished by the council. They sought false witness against Jesus (Matt. 26: 59), yet would not defile themselves by entering the palace of Pilate (18: 28), and prayed that the bodies of Jesus and those crucified with Him might not remain upon the cross over the Sabbath (19: 31).

The ritual law was given for the purpose of separation and education. When the time of separation is ended, and the work of education is complete, the law has served its purpose and plays no further part in the economy of redemption. The sacrificial system terminated with the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world. The exclusive privileges of the Jews shall cease, for there are sheep outside the fold of Judaism that shall be gathered into the flock of the good Shepherd (10: 16). He laid down the principle that must abolish the distinction between clean and unclean meats (Mark 7: 19), "this he said, making all meats clean"—though even Peter did not understand until the vision and the voice came to him years afterwards upon the house-top in Joppa (Acts 10).

But while Jesus thus recognized the temporary and provisional character of the ceremonial law, He rendered it unsailing obedience, for it was abrogated only by His death. Then He blotted out

### 34 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

the bond written in ordinances that was against us (Col. 2: 14). The temple, though He foretold its destruction, must be held in reverence as the house of God, and in the beginning of His ministry He drove out those who were making His Father's house a house of merchandise. He habitually worshipped and taught in temple and synagogue (5: 14; 6: 59; 7: 14, 28; 8: 20, 59; 10: 23). "He entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the Sabbath day" (Luke 4: 16). "I sat daily in the temple teaching" (Matt. 26: 55). "I ever taught in synagogues and in the temple" (18: 20).

Here the question arises whether the evangelist interprets correctly the words of Jesus in 2: 19—"Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Are the words to be taken literally, as by the Jews, who suborned witnesses to testify that He said, *I will* destroy, (Matt. 26: 61; 27: 40; Mark 14: 58; 15: 29; Acts 6: 14), or did He refer to His body, as John affirms? If He spoke of the temple, He indicated His attitude towards the old dispensation. You through your sin and your unbelief are about to destroy the Mosaic system. Go on, complete your work, and I will restore it speedily in its true spiritual significance. The kingdom of God is one, unfolding in successive stages. The lower merges in the higher, is fulfilled in it, as the bud bursts into flower, as childhood ripens into

manhood. But it is highly improbable that John and his fellow-disciples were in error. Closer examination will confirm the interpretation of the evangelist. The obvious reference of the words of Jesus to the temple and the application of them to Himself are harmonized by the consideration that the temple, as the earthly dwelling of God, was the type of the body of Jesus, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in bodily form (Col. 2:9; John 14:10, 20). Moreover the fortunes of the temple were bound up with His person. His death was the signal for the destruction of the temple, the end of the Jewish economy. Then was the vail of the temple rent, then was the house left desolate. His resurrection marked the restoration of the kingdom in a higher and nobler form. The old falls with His death, the new rises with His resurrection. In destroying Him they destroy the temple, in rising He restores it. As He rose with a body new, yet the same, so there rises with Him a new dispensation, yet the same church.

Jesus never transgressed the law of Moses in any particular, so far as the narrative records. As a Jew He held Himself bound to obey it in all its parts. "Thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness," He said, when He sought baptism at the hands of John (Matt. 3:15). His words in Matt. 5:17—"I came not to destroy but to fulfil"—refer primarily to His teaching, in which

## 36 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

He completed or drew out the full meaning of the law: but that involved of necessity personal obedience. The Jews accused Him upon various occasions of breaking the law, but He always denied it, and retorted the charge upon them. They did not believe Moses (5:46). "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you doeth the law?" (7:19). They transgressed the law to keep their traditions, He transgressed their traditions to keep the law (Mark 7:8, 9). "All that came before me," He said, "are thieves and robbers" (10:8). The present tense points directly to the rulers of the time. The law He termed *your law*, as He called Abraham *your father*, not to distinguish Himself from them, but to emphasize their position and their responsibility. It is your own law that you break, your own father whom you dishonor. Nicodemus asked of the Pharisees, You who curse the people for not knowing the law, are you about to break the law? (7:51).

He regarded the law therefore in all its parts as binding upon Himself as upon them. From this it follows that the chronology of the Gospel is determined by the Jewish feasts. We might infer from the earlier Gospels that His ministry was limited to a single year; as indeed was taught by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1:21), by Origen, doubtfully (*De Princ.* 4:1, 5. See on the other hand *c. Cels.* 2:12), and by certain

heretics (*Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1: 3, 3). This theory has recently been revived, and  $\tau\delta\pi\alpha\sigma\chi\alpha$  in 6: 4 is held to be an interpolation (see Hort-App. to W. H. Greek Testament, pp. 77-81). But the argument turns upon inferences drawn from the language of early Christian writers, and has little force against the unanimous witness of the manuscripts (see Hastings' B. D. Art. *Chron. New Testament*, Vol. I, p. 407). It is evident from John's narrative that the ministry extended over the space of two or three years and several months (see Hastings' B. D. as above, p. 410d).

The feasts named are:

- |                          |              |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Passover . . . . .    | 2: 13        |
| 2. Uncertain . . . . .   | 5: 1         |
| 3. Passover . . . . .    | 6: 4         |
| 4. Tabernacles . . . . . | 7: 2         |
| 5. Dedication . . . . .  | 10: 22       |
| 6. Last Passover . . .   | 11: 55-12: 1 |

Of these feasts Jesus attended all but the third, which He omitted because the Jews sought to kill Him. There is no reason to suppose that there were other Passovers during His ministry besides those recorded here. If the second of these feasts was a Passover, His ministry embraced a period of over three years. If not, it was confined to two years and some months. The choice lies between Passover and Purim, and Purim is to be preferred for these reasons —

## 38 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

1. The reading *εορτή*, without the article, attested by the weight of evidence, points to one of the minor feasts. It is unlikely that John would refer to the Passover in this casual way, especially as in every other instance it is carefully named.

2. In 4:35, "Say not ye, there are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest?" we have probably a definite note of time, and not a mere proverbial expression. Four months before harvest would be December. In 6:4 we have a Passover. Between these dates occurs the feast of Purim.

3. If this feast is Passover, there is a year of which John makes no record, from 5:1 to 6:4. And the more the chronology of John is extended, the more difficult it becomes to harmonize his narrative with that of the synoptists.

4. If this feast is Passover, there was an interval of eighteen months during which Jesus never visited Jerusalem; which is highly improbable, in view of His habitual observance of the law. There is no reason to suppose that the hostility of the Jews was more pronounced during that time than it was later, when He did visit the city.

5. It is true that the Jews were not required to attend the feast of Purim. But Jesus did not visit Jerusalem only when He must; He visited it whenever He could.

For these reasons it is probable, though it cannot be demonstrated, that the feast was Purim. The method of John differs widely from that of the modern historian. Points of great chronological importance are left undetermined, while there is frequent reference to the succession of days, and the very hour is often named, because vividly impressed upon the memory of the evangelist.

Two specific charges of law-breaking were brought against Jesus by the Jews:

(a) Blasphemy, in making himself equal with God (5:18; 10:33). This was the accusation that they pressed before Pilate (19:7). His answer we shall consider hereafter (ch. 4).

(b) Twice He was charged with Sabbath breaking, when He healed the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda (5:16), and when He restored the blind man to sight (9). In the second instance the blind man defended his benefactor upon the ground that "if this man were not from God, he could do nothing." In the first instance the Jews persecuted Jesus because He broke (*ελυε*) the Sabbath, not simply violated the law in a specific case, but by His teaching and example was abrogating it altogether. He justified Himself by appealing to the example of His Father. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." The law of the Sabbath is founded upon the example of God. He rested on the

## 40 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

seventh day, therefore He blessed and hallowed it. To be like Him is the supreme law of human life. But His rest does not exclude beneficent activity. Though the work of creation is completed, the work of providence is unceasing. His Sabbath is full of good works, and the seventh day is set apart for the purpose of glorifying God and ministering to the needs of men. To do good on the Sabbath is to fulfil the purpose of the Sabbath. It was made for man, therefore man may be healed. It is true in general therefore that it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day (Matt. 12: 12). Jesus asserts His peculiar relation to God—"My Father"—not to exempt Himself from the law of the Sabbath, but to emphasize His obedience to it. He did not say, I break the Sabbath as God breaks it, but, I keep the Sabbath as God keeps it. He did not assert, God is not bound by the law, nor am I, for He never admitted that He transgressed the law; but rather, I do not violate the Sabbath, but observe it according to its true purpose and intent, as shown by the example of God Himself. It is true of course that the claim of authority over the Sabbath is implicitly contained in the claim of equality with God; but here He is not justifying Himself for breaking the law, but clearing Himself of the charge of breaking it. So in Matt. 12: 1 ff. and Mark 2: 23 ff. before He asserted His authority

over the Sabbath He refuted the charge of Sabbath breaking, and justified His conduct by examples drawn from the Old Testament. The law of the Sabbath is the law of necessity and mercy, and by works of necessity and mercy the Sabbath is not abrogated but fulfilled. The institution of the Sabbath is in part ceremonial and in part moral, and the law itself provides that the ceremonial shall yield to the moral, the *form* to the *purpose* of the commandment.

On a subsequent visit to Jerusalem (7:21) He renewed His defense before the Jews, and as before He had appealed to the example of God, now He appealed to their own conduct; as in Matt. 12:11; Luke 13:15. The argument is valid in so far as they obey the law, for then it is virtually drawn from the law itself. What I did once in healing, you do habitually in circumcision; but you in symbol and I in fact. You on the Sabbath circumcise a child that the Scripture may not be broken. "For this cause"—for the very reason for which My work of healing was wrought—"Moses gave you circumcision." Circumcision signifies purification; I have restored the whole man to health. Which is greater, the partial or the perfect, the symbol or the fact? In circumcision you *represent* what I *accomplish*. It may be objected indeed that circumcision has a moral significance, while the healing was purely physical. But the moral ele-

## 42 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

ment of the miracle lay in the fact that disease is the fruit of sin, in this instance directly (5:14), so that the healing was the lifting of the curse, and in so far accomplished what circumcision signified.

Thus though He was Lord of the Sabbath He observed the Sabbath throughout His life on earth. Subsequently He exercised His authority through His apostles in changing it from the seventh to the first day of the week to commemorate His resurrection. No stress can be laid upon the fact that He appeared to His disciples on the first day of the week (20:26), unless it could be shown that all His appearances were upon that day. We conclude that the change was ordered simply because we see that the change was made.

As a Jew then, born under the law, Jesus obeyed the law of Moses in all its precepts.

The Old Testament is commonly regarded, however, not in its legal but in its prophetic character. The law itself is prophecy. "Moses wrote of me" (5:46). Of Him Moses and the prophets did write (1:45). The Scriptures testify of Him (5:39). The law not only prophesied of Him, but prepared the way for Him. Without the law the Samaritans had not known of the Christ (4:25). But the law alone conveys an inadequate and imperfect conception of God, for the prophecies with their foreshadowing of the

Savior are the heart of the Word. Therefore He said to the Samaritans, who received the law and rejected the prophets, "Ye worship ye know not what" (4 : 22). The popular conception of Him was drawn from the types and prophecies of the Scripture. He was regarded as a prophet (6 : 14; 7 : 40; 9 : 17), King of Israel (12 : 13), the Christ (7 : 41; 11 : 27), the Lamb of God (1 : 29, 36). The thought of the *Logos*, as we shall see, is deeply rooted in the Old Testament. He represented Himself as the Christ (4), and was crucified because He made Himself Son of God and King of the Jews (19 : 7, 12). The figures by which He is represented are drawn almost exclusively from the Old Testament—the Lamb of God (1 : 29), the temple (2 : 19), the brazen serpent (3 : 14), the manna (6 : 31ff.), the good shepherd (10), the vine (15). If external suggestion for the figure of the vine is sought, the most probable is the wine of which the disciples had just partaken. But none is required. He is the true vine in contrast with Israel, the degenerate vine, which yielded only wild grapes (Isaiah 5).

The enemies of Jesus appealed to the prophecies as well as to the law. He does not observe the law, they said, he does not fulfil the prophecies. In two respects particularly this charge was pressed; neither His origin nor His end was in accord with prophecy. 1. His origin. Four

## 44 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

times this objection was raised. (*a*) At the feast of tabernacles. "Howbeit we know this man whence he is ; but when the Christ cometh, no one knoweth whence he is" (7 : 27). They knew of course that the Christ should be born in Bethlehem, but here they refer not to His birth-place but to His public appearance. We know this man, his home, his life hitherto, but the Christ shall appear suddenly, unexpectedly, we know not whence (comp. Dan. 7 : 13; Justin Martyr, Dial. 8; Book of Enoch 62 : 7). Jesus answered that they knew His earthly origin, but were ignorant of His divine mission. "Ye both know me, and know whence I am ; and I am not come of myself, but He that sent me is true, whom ye know not." They recognize in Him the son of Mary, but not the Son of God. (*b*) A little later, on the last day of the feast, the multitude was divided, and some said, "This is the Christ." But others said, "What, doth the Christ come out of Galilee? hath not the Scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was ?" (7 : 41, 42). (*c*) When Nicodemus invoked the law in His behalf before the council, the Pharisees asked, "Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet" (7 : 52). That they should venture an assertion so obviously untrue shows to what lengths they were driven by their hatred of

Jesus. The question of Nathaniel, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (1:46) was suggested by the bad name of the town.

(d) When the blind man whom Jesus had healed defended his benefactor, the Pharisees answered, "Thou art his disciple; but we are the disciples of Moses. We know that God hath spoken unto Moses; but as for this man, we know not whence he is" (9:29). He bears no credentials, holds no commission from any recognized authority. The man replied that the divine commission was attested by the exercise of divine power. His miracles were His credentials. "If this man were not from God, he could do nothing." He is from God because He does the works of God. So Nicodemus declared, "No man can do these signs that thou doest, except God be with him" (3:2).

2. His end. He said, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." But the multitude answered, "We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth forever; and how sayest thou, the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" (12:33, 34). You say that the Son of man must die. He cannot then be the Christ, for the Christ abideth forever. Who is he? Jesus gave no answer to the question, but warned them that He should soon be taken away, and bade them walk while they had the light.

## 46 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

To this double test of the law and the prophets, Jesus submitted His claims. He constantly affirmed, I keep the law and fulfil the types and prophecies of the Scripture. He summoned in His defense Abraham (8:56) and Moses (5:46), and the evangelist adds Isaiah (12:41)—patriarch, lawgiver, prophet, representing the great epochs of the history of Israel.

Thus Jesus and the Jews agreed in accepting the Scripture as the Word of God, but they differed widely in their interpretation of it. The most conspicuous points of variance were the law of the Sabbath, as we have seen, and the conception of the Messiah. It was the common expectation of the time that the Christ should be a temporal king. The multitude sought to carry Him to Jerusalem and place Him upon the throne of His father David (6:15). He who claims to be the Christ must be a rival of Cæsar (19:12). On the other hand He taught that His kingdom was not of this world, and was not to be established or maintained by the sword, but was a kingdom of truth, spiritual in its nature, to be entered only through regeneration. He asserted His Messianic rights by cleansing the temple in the beginning of His ministry, and showed that His mission was one of purification and judgment. And again at the close of His ministry He entered Jerusalem in triumph as a King, but in lowly guise, riding

upon an ass, to signify that He came upon an errand of peace and salvation.

Quotations from the Old Testament are less frequent than in the earlier Gospels. Matthew records forty-eight, Mark twenty-three, Luke twenty-three, and John thirteen. They are :—

1. "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord" (1:23)—from Is. 40:3.

2. "The zeal of thine house shall eat me up" (2:17)—from Ps. 69:9.

3. "He gave them bread out of heaven to eat" (6:31)—from Ps. 78:24.

4. "And they shall all be taught of God" (6:45)—from Is. 54:13.

5. "I said, ye are gods" (10:34)—from Ps. 82:6.

6. "Fear not, daughter of Zion: behold, thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt" (12:15)—from Zech. 9:9.

7. "Lord, who hath believed our report? And to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" (12:38)—from Is. 53:1.

8. "He hath blinded their eyes, and he hardened their heart; lest they should see with their eyes, and perceive with their heart, and should turn, and I should heal them" (12:40)—from Is. 6:10.

9. "He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me" (13:18)—from Ps. 41:9.

## 48 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

10. "They hated me without a cause" (15:25)—from Ps. 35:19.

11. "They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" (19:24)—from Ps. 22:18.

12. "A bone of him shall not be broken" (19:36)—from the account of the paschal lamb in Ex. 12:46; Num. 9:12. Less apt is the reference to Ps. 34:20, where the preservation of life is spoken of—"He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken."

13. "They shall look on him whom they pierced" (19:37)—from Zech. 12:10.

Of these citations one is from the law, six are from the Psalms, and six from the prophets, four from Isaiah and two from Zechariah. Eight of them fall within the closing scenes of Jesus' ministry.

There are also several allusions to the Old Testament which are not direct quotations. 1. "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water" (7:38). It is possible to join the clause, "as the Scripture hath said," with the clause preceding, so as to read, "he that believeth according to the Scripture." But it is much more readily taken as the common formula of quotation. The words cited are nowhere found in the Old Testament, though the thought lies in such passages as Is. 58:11; Zech. 14:8; Prov. 18:4;

Ezek. 47; Joel 2:28. In 4:14,—“He that drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst”—the thought is personal salvation, a fountain of life within : here it is the outflow of the life in beneficent power.

2. The cry of the multitude as He entered Jerusalem—“Hosanna : blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord” (12:13). See Ps. 118:25, 26.

3. “I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition ; that the Scripture might be fulfilled” (17:12). See Ps. 18:9; 109:8; Acts 1:20.

4. “After this, Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished, that the Scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst” (19:28). See Ps. 69:21. *That the Scripture might be accomplished* may be joined with the preceding clause, but as in the view of John every detail in the crucifixion scene is significant, it is better to connect it with the words that follow.

5. “As yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead” (20:9). Comp. 2:22. See Ps. 16:10.

In none of these instances of quotation is there a material departure from the sense of the original, except in 12:40, which reads, “He hath blinded their eyes, and he hardened their heart,” while Isaiah says, “Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their

## 50 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

eyes" (6:10). God is represented as doing what He bids the prophet do. In Mark (4:12) and Luke (8:10) the passage is cited as a reason for the use of parables. Matthew renders, "This people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed" (13:15. See also Acts 28:26; Luke 19:42; Romans 1:24, 26, 28—"God gave them up"). It is obvious that passages are sometimes applied to Christ which bore a different sense in the original. The principle of double reference is so abundantly illustrated in the Scripture, as in all literature, that it is strange it should ever be denied. (See Johnson's *Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*, ch. 9.) The words of Bacon are profoundly true—"Divine prophesies; being of the nature of their author, with whom a thousand years are but as one day; and therefore are not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishment throughout many ages, though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age" ("Advancement of Learning," book 2). Thus there may be various fulfilments of a single prophecy. Sometimes the larger reference was unknown to the prophet, but lay in the mind of the Spirit who spake through him.

The assumption then that underlies all Jesus' treatment of the Old Testament, whether law or prophecy, is that the Scripture cannot be broken

(10: 35). Differing modes of rendering the passage do not materially modify the meaning. If this clause, like the preceding, be conditional, in both instances the condition is assumed, and has the force of an emphatic assertion. If *the Scripture* means the particular passage cited, that passage is held to be true because it is Scripture, and every portion of the Word belongs to the same category. In "Thy word is truth" (17: 17) the Old Testament is included.

Of degrees of inspiration or of authority in the Word, of the distinction between matters of fact and articles of faith, between history and morals, there is no trace in the Gospel. The theological implications of the fact do not fall within our present purpose. Whether Jesus spoke by way of accommodation only, or whether questions of this nature lay beyond the horizon of His knowledge, we do not stop to inquire; it is enough to refer to what is said of His teaching in chapter four. Here we simply note the fact which lies upon the face of the Gospel, as of the New Testament throughout, that so far as the record indicates no question of the absolute trustworthiness and authority of the Old Testament in all matters of which it treats ever entered the mind of Jesus or His disciples.

The remark of Augustine is true, *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet*—the New Testament is latent in the

## 52 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

Old, the Old is patent in the New. All the essential truths of the later are germinally contained in the earlier revelation. Nicodemus as a master in Israel should have known of the new birth; the Scripture prophesied of the Christ throughout; Abraham saw His day, and Isaiah His glory. His death was prefigured by the brazen serpent, and the circumstances attending it were predicted in detail. His resurrection was foretold and foreshadowed. Under both dispensations men are saved by grace through faith. God gives, that is grace; man receives, that is faith. Man must believe in God and trust in God so far as He has made Himself known. Since Christ is the highest revelation of God, wherever He is known generic faith in God becomes specific faith in Him (3:36; Gen. 15:6; Is. 7:9; Hab. 2:4). To reject Him is to reject God as He is most clearly and fully disclosed. Every conception of God is false or inadequate except that which is furnished in the Son.

At the same time the New Testament does not simply repeat the Old, it *fulfils* it. Truth before obscurely indicated is brought to light. In the forefront of the Gospel the law that was given by Moses is set in contrast with the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ. Moses saw only the back of God (Ex. 33:23), the Son lies in His bosom (1:18). The law *was given*, a single act, grace and truth *came* in continuous unfolding.

They are inseparable from the person of the Word. The law is opposed to grace, because it does not save but condemn ; to truth, not because it is false, but because it is partial and imperfect. The law was light in comparison with the darkness of nature ; it is darkness in comparison with the light of the gospel. Through the law is the knowledge but not the forgiveness of sin. The heavens declare the glory of God, the law declares His will, the gospel declares His grace.

Thus Abraham rejoiced to see the day of Christ, because in Him he recognized the fulfilment of the covenant and the promises (8 : 56). It is plain from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16 : 19ff.), that Abraham's relation to earth was not terminated by death. The birth of Jesus was known to the angels, and formed the theme of angelic song. Moses and Elijah upon the holy mount spake with Him of His decease, which He should accomplish at Jerusalem (Luke 9 : 31). As it was given to them to know of His death, so was it given to Abraham to know of His birth. He rejoiced in anticipation of the day of Christ when the promise was given, he saw it in paradise and was glad when the promise was fulfilled.

## II

### THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

GOD is One, was the teaching of the Old Testament; God is One in Three Persons, is the teaching of the New. The Unity was established before the Trinity was disclosed. There is no formal statement of the doctrine in Gospel or Epistle, or indeed in the New Testament, but the attributes of Deity are ascribed to Father, Son and Spirit. Monotheism developed on the one side into the hard and sterile unitarianism of the Koran, on the other side into the rich and fruitful trinitarianism of the gospel. The mutual relation of the Three Persons passes our comprehension, for there are no analogies to represent it. Now the full force of the challenge is seen, “To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto Him?” (Is. 40: 18). St. Patrick is said to have used the shamrock by way of illustration, three leaves on a single stem. When a heathen philosopher at the Council of Nice ridiculed the doctrine of the Trinity, it is related that Spyridion took a brick, and said, “You deny that Three can be One. Look at this: it is one, and yet it is composed of the

three elements of fire, earth and water." As he spoke, the fire flew upward, the clay remained in his hand and the water fell to the ground (Stanley's *Eastern Church*, Lect. 3:6, p. 109). Augustine (*On the Trinity*, books 9-12) and others have sought analogy in the constitution of man, for example, in the memory, the understanding and the will; but the union of parts in one person throws little light on the union of persons in one nature. (Compare Thos. Aquinas I. 93, 5—"Utrum in homine sit imago Dei quantum ad Trinitatem Personarum?"—whether there is found in man the image of God as to the Trinity of Persons, which he answers, following Augustine [id. 7], in the affirmative.) Yet the illustration, as will appear, may serve to relieve though it cannot remove the difficulty. While the doctrine of the Trinity transcends reason, because there is no parallel to it within the range of our experience, it is not contrary to reason. Two suggestions may be found helpful. (a) As life assumes higher forms, it is governed by a double law—a growing unity of organism, an increasing diversity of parts. The more highly developed the creature, the greater are the differences that prevail between its members, the closer are the bonds that unite them. The unity becomes more perfect, the parts become more distinct. Creation in this regard reflects the likeness of God. In Him for distinction of parts

## 56 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

is found distinction of Persons, and these Persons are one God. The term Person may mislead by suggesting the idea of separation and limitation, but we have no better with which to express the thought. "Yet when the question is asked, What Three? human language labors altogether under great poverty of speech. The answer, however, is given, 'three persons,' not that it might be (completely) spoken, but that it might not be left (wholly) unspoken." "For see if there appear not a kind of number, Father and Son and Holy Ghost—the Trinity. If three, three what? Here number fails. And so God neither keeps apart from number, nor is comprehended by number. Because there are three, there is a kind of number. If you ask three what, number ceases. . . . Only in their relation to each other do they suggest number, not in their essential existence. . . . I have no name to give the three, save the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, one God, one Almighty" (Augustine on John, Tract 39:4). (b) God is love. Love implies an object. A loving nature is indeed abstractly conceivable without an object beloved, but it would lack satisfaction, completeness. The infinite and eternal love of God implies an object infinite and eternal. He who is forever love must love forever. Infinite love cannot find its satisfaction in the finite creation. In the Godhead subject and object are

found together, and in the mutual love of Father, Son, and Spirit God is in Himself sufficient and complete. “*Ubi amor, ibi Trinitas*”—where there is love, there is the Trinity.

Whatever is true of the Divine Nature is true of each of the Persons of the Trinity, for they differ not in essence, but in office and relation. The name ( $\delta$ ) Θεός is given to the undivided Trinity, or, if distinction of Persons is indicated, almost always to the Father, *fons Deitatis*, of whom the Son is begotten, from whom primarily the Spirit proceeds. It is rarely used of the Son, in John’s Gospel only in 1:1 and 20:28, perhaps also in 1:18. There is no undisputed instance elsewhere in the New Testament, though it is difficult to escape the reference in Rom. 9:5 and Heb. 1:8. More doubtful are such passages as these—“Looking for the blessed hope, and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ” (Titus 2:13);<sup>1</sup> “Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained a like precious faith with us in the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ” (2 Peter 1:1);<sup>2</sup> “And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know him

<sup>1</sup> The margin reads—the great God and our Savior. This the American revisers prefer.

<sup>2</sup> The margin reads—our God and the Savior. This the American revisers prefer.

## 58 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, "and eternal life" (1 John 5:20). It is ascribed to the Holy Spirit in Acts 5:3,4—"Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost . . . thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." The Three Persons are associated in the baptismal formula and in the apostolic benediction. The present chapter treats of the Triune God, for in nature and attributes the Three are One. When the reference is specifically to the Father, the distinction is expressly drawn.

Two names are given to God in this Gospel. He is Spirit, He is Father.

i. God is a Spirit, or better, God is Spirit (4:24). The term expresses His essential nature. He is a Person. If indeed the marks of personality be self-consciousness and self-determination, God is the only complete Personality. He is One. He is not corporeal or material, and therefore is not apprehended by the senses, nor subject to the limitations of space and time. Thus the question where He should be worshipped is answered. Though for a time He appointed a particular place, that was an accommodation to human weakness, and under the new dispensation worship may everywhere be rendered to Him who is everywhere present. (Acts 17:24—"The God that made the world and all things therein . . . dwelleth not in tem-

ples made with hands.") Nor should it be forgotten that even under the law of Moses it was only the outward and formal rites of worship that were restricted to the temple. The offering of praise and prayer might be made in every place. (Deut. 30 : 1-3, Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple—2 Chron. 6 : 12ff.; Malachi 1 : 11—"For from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto my name, and a pure offering." So often in the Psalms.) The local synagogue everywhere established was a legitimate out-growth of the law. (Acts 15 : 21—"For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.")

The definition answered moreover a question of greater moment, not only where God should be worshipped, but how. Worship Him not in form, as the Jews, but in spirit; not in error, as the Samaritans, but in truth. The worship rendered must be such as accords with His character. If He be a Spirit, rites and forms and sacrifices will not suffice. There must be the response of spirit to Spirit. He is Spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit, in that part of man's nature which reflects the divine. He is the only true God (17: 3), and must be worshipped in truth; not merely in sincerity, but with that worship

## 60 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

which corresponds to His nature. He must be worshipped for what He is. It is no better to worship the work of men's fancy than the work of men's hands. Worship must be rendered in the sphere in which God dwells : as He is Spirit in spirit, as He is true in truth.

The spirituality and omnipresence of God were disclosed in the Old Testament, but were often obscured in the minds of the people by the Mosaic ritual, though taught by Moses and constantly insisted upon by the prophets. He formed the earth and divided the nations. "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. 32: 8). "Behold heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee ; how much less this house that I have builded" (2 Chron. 6: 18). "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?" (Ps. 139; Is. 40). "Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord" (Jer. 23: 24). Never is He represented as a local or tribal divinity, but always as the Lord of the whole earth.<sup>1</sup>

The attributes of God are rather assumed than defined, and the teaching of the Old Testament is presupposed. To Him are ascribed eternity ("In the beginning" 1: 1. "Before the world was" 17: 5. "This is the true God, and eternal

<sup>1</sup> Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy*, 91.

life" 1 John 5:20); truth ("God is true" 3:33. "He that sent me is true" 8:26. "Thy word is truth" 17:17); wisdom ("They shall all be taught of God" 6:45. "God . . . knoweth all things" 1 John 3:20); power ("My Father . . . is greater than all" 10:29); providence ("My Father worketh even until now" 5:17); holiness ("Holy Father" 17:11. "O righteous Father" 17:25); love ("God is love" 1 John 4:8, 16. "God so loved the world" 3:16); judgment, which He commits to the Son (5:22, 27). He is the fountain of life (5:26), and of love. All the love that beats in the breast of man springs from the heart of God. ("We love because he first loved us" 1 John 4:19.) Compare Acts 17:25, 28—"He himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things." "In him we live, and move, and have our being." All good works are wrought in Him (3:21). The final cause of all things is His glory, the manifestation of His divine perfections. "Father, glorify thy name" (12:28). "Glorify thy Son, that the Son may glorify thee" (17:1). "I glorified thee on the earth" (17:4). To this end sickness and death are ordained; as in the case of the blind man, Lazarus, and Peter (9:3; 11:4, 40; 21:19). In the glory of God is included the good of the creature, for to know Him is life eternal (17:3).

Though God is everywhere present, yet heaven

## 62 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

is represented as His abode, the place in which, as of old in the temple, He reveals Himself most clearly and graciously to His creatures. There His throne is set (Ps. 11:4). "The Lord hath established his throne in the heavens" (Ps. 103:19); or, in a larger view, the universe is His kingdom, and heaven is His throne. "The heaven is thy throne, and the earth is thy footstool" (Is. 66:1). "Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God" (Matt. 5:34). To heaven men lift their eyes, and there He waits to hear and answer prayer. "Jesus listed up his eyes" (11:41; 17:1. Compare the prayer of Solomon, 1 Kings 8:30ff). He dwells in heaven, and with the humble heart (Is. 57:15). Heaven is the Father's house (14:2). It is the heart of the universe, whence the tides of power and goodness and grace flow forth throughout the wide creation. From heaven all good gifts descend to men—"man can receive nothing, except it have been given him from heaven" (3:27). "Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above" (Jas. 1:17); thence the Holy Spirit is given. "I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven" (1:32). "If I go, I will send him unto you" (16:7). It is the abode of the angels, the seat of the divine glory. Though Jesus was always in the bosom of the Father (1:18), always rejoiced in His presence

and His love, yet for Him too heaven was the dwelling-place of God, His home. He came from heaven. "He that descended out of heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven" (3:13). "I am come down from heaven" (6:38). Again He left the world and returned to the Father. "I came out from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world, and go unto the Father" (16:28; 20:17). There He shares the glory of the Father, and imparts His glory to His disciples (17:5, 22, 24).

"*God is Spirit*" defines Him as He is in Himself in the most unrestricted sense, His absolute and eternal nature. John uses other terms which describe His moral character, and His relation to the universe. Metaphysically, in essence, He is Spirit; morally, in character, He is light and love. These terms introduce the moral element which is wanting in Spirit. Spirit may be good or evil; light and love are always and only good. Spirit is the genus, light and love are the differentia, of the definition. In each instance the term is chosen to serve a practical purpose, to enforce a duty or commend a grace of the Christian life. The representation of God is always related to the conduct of man. God is Spirit, worship Him in spirit; God is light, walk in the light; God is love, abide in love.

*God is light* (1 John 1:5) expresses at once His

## 64 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

moral character, as pure and holy, and His relation to the universe. It belongs to the nature of light to impart itself freely. It illumines, quickens and sustains life, gives itself with largest liberality, yet is not diminished or impoverished by giving. The light shines by virtue of its being, can cease to shine only when it ceases to be. It is therefore a term at once of character and of relation, and signifies that God is self-imparting truth and holiness. His disclosure and gift of Himself is complete in Christ, Whose life is the light of men, illuminating all. He is the light which lighteth every man (1 : 9). "I am the light of the world" (8 : 12). God reveals Himself to men and gives Himself to men in His Son.

*God is love* (1 John 4 : 8, 16) is also a term both of character and of relation more closely defined. *Light* expresses His relation to the universe—*love* expresses the relation between the Persons of the Trinity on the one hand, and the relation of God to His intelligent creatures on the other. Three objects of the Father's love are named, the Son, believers, the world. This is the highest revelation of the divine nature. God is holy, is the central thought of the Old Testament; God is love, is the central thought of the New. Love is not so much an attribute of God as it is His inmost self. Therefore love is represented as the crown of Christian graces, because it is in

love that man approaches most nearly to the likeness of God. Faith and hope spring from the imperfection of the creature; love is the image of the Creator. God does not believe, or hope, but God is love. Therefore love is God-like.

The distinction is clearly drawn in fact, though not in form, between the love of benevolence and the love of complacency. The love of *benevolence* is that good will which God cherishes towards all His creatures. "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. 5 : 45). He loved the world and gave His Son for it (3 : 16), and "willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2 : 4). It is interesting to observe the shifts to which Augustine resorts to escape the evident meaning of these words (Enchir. c. 103). "Not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Peter 3 : 9). Yet this love does not issue in the salvation of all men, and is not inconsistent with wrath and judgment. There is no stranger conjunction of words in Scripture than the phrase of Rev. 6 : 16, "The wrath of the Lamb." The Savior shall be the judge (5 : 22).

In the interpretation of passages like those just cited two considerations must be borne in mind. (a) God wills the salvation of the world,

## 66 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

the race in its organic unity, and the world shall be saved. Mankind that fell in Adam is redeemed in Christ. This does not indeed involve the salvation of every individual member of the race, for there are those who are plainly excepted; but the presumption is in favor of salvation, and all are saved whom the Scripture does not expressly designate as lost. This conception of the unity of the race is prominent in John.

(b) There are passages, however, that are not satisfied by this general reference. In 2 Peter 3:9 it is certainly possible that *any* and *all* are limited by *you*, so that the sentence means, "Not wishing that any of *you* should perish, but that all of *you* should come to repentance." But invitations like that which opens wide the gates of mercy in Rev. 22: 17—"he that will, let him take the water of life freely," are the evidence and expression of a love which goes out to every child of man. The race is distributed into its component parts, and it is not the mass that is named but the several individuals that compose it. God wills not only the salvation of the race, but in some sense of every member of the race. We must either believe then that God wills the salvation of all men not absolutely but conditionally, so that if any are lost it is because the conditions of salvation are not met—"How often would I . . . and ye would not!" (Luke

13: 34); or we must distinguish between the will of *desire* and the will of *purpose*, and recognize that because God is both merciful and just He *desires* the salvation of all while He *purposes* and *secures* the salvation of some.

Neither alternative may be disregarded. We must do justice to both classes of Scripture texts, those that proclaim the divine sovereignty in election, and those that leave room for the play of human freedom beneath the divine decree, and make the sinner responsible for his guilt and penalty. To reconcile these varying representations is beyond our power. We accept them both as true, because both are attested by the Word.

The love of *complacency* is that peculiar affection which God has for those whom He has made His children in Christ, and in whom He is well pleased. They are constantly distinguished from the world, and God is said to love them in a special sense. "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father" (14: 21). "The Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came forth from the Father" (16: 27). This is the love which not only desires but purposes and secures the welfare of the beloved.

This distinction must be borne in mind when we consider the relation between the holiness and the love of God. These attributes are sometimes

## 68 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

unhappily represented as antagonistic. Again it is taught that holiness is rooted in the nature, but love in the will of God, which is wholly untrue; and it is affirmed that God may be gracious but must be just. There is a measure of truth in the statement, but it must be carefully guarded. Love is not a matter of option with God. If He is love, He must love. If He did not love, He would cease to be Himself. He must wish well to all His creatures. But He is not bound to love them all alike, else there were no room for discriminating grace. He desires the salvation of all, purposes the salvation of some. It is of His nature to love, it is of His will to determine the measure and manifestation of love. Love with Him is not an unreasoning impulse, and is exercised with due regard to the interests of justice and holiness. He does not love believers as He loves His Son, He does not love the world as He loves believers. Why He loves and chooses one above another is known to Him alone. That He loves all men alike is contradicted by Scripture and by the whole course of human history.

These titles, then, Spirit, Light, Love, express the metaphysical and moral nature of God, His relation to the universe in general, and His particular relation to His intelligent creatures, especially to man.

2. FATHER. This is the name that distinguishes the First Person of the Trinity.

Spirit is a term of character, Father is a term of relation, though, of course, in the relation character is involved. Spirit denotes what God is in Himself, Father, what He is to others.

The word is used primarily of His relation to Jesus. He is Son of God in a sense unique, the only begotten (1:14, 18; 3:16, 18). He did not say to men, Our Father, but My Father and your Father (20:17). The question in what sense He affirmed that He was the Son of God will be considered in the chapter following.

He often spoke of *My Father*, yet oftener of *the Father*. Sometimes in contrast to *the Son* the phrase refers simply to His relation to Jesus, but ordinarily it has a broader reference. Here we must distinguish with care between the *conception* and the *application* of the term. *The Father* signifies in general Him in whom the attributes of fatherhood are found in the highest degree and in the noblest exercise. God is *the Father* because in Him all that pertains to the character of father is perfect. When we turn to consider the *application* of the term, we are confronted by the inquiry which fills so large a place in modern theology, of whom is God the Father? Of all men, or of believers only? To this question the answer of the Word is definite and clear.

Scripture teaches a threefold Fatherhood of God.

## 70 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

(a) Natural. He is the Father of all men by nature, not simply as their Maker, for in that sense He is the Father of all intelligent creatures—"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named" (Eph. 3: 14, 15); and even of the inanimate creation—"Father of lights" (Jas. 1: 17); but because He has imparted to them a nature kindred to His own, which is the essential note of fatherhood. This is plainly taught in the record of the creation of man, and is confirmed by the New Testament. "Adam, the son of God" (Luke 3: 38). Upon this common ground Paul met the men of Athens. "We"—you who worship idols, and I who preach to you the gospel—"are also his offspring" (Acts 17: 28). This is obviously the lowest form of the relation which men sustain to God, for they are by nature the children of wrath (Eph. 2: 3). "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (3: 36). The rights and privileges of sonship have been forfeited by sin. Yet this natural relation is fundamental, for it is the basis of all communion between God and man, and underlies the mystery of the incarnation. God may assume the form of man because man was made in the likeness of God. The Eternal Word may become the Son of man because man is by nature the son of God. He could not take upon him a nature

wholly foreign to his own. He could not become that which is altogether unlike himself. The mind, the heart, the will of man reflect the mind, the heart, the will of God. If it were not so, the Scripture would speak to us in an unknown tongue. We read that God is great, and wise, and holy, and good; but what meaning do the words convey to us unless they have the same significance in the speech of heaven as in the speech of earth? We gather the meaning of these words from our own experience. How can God invite men "Come now and let us reason together," if reason be not the same in Him and in them? How can He bid us, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," if holiness be not the same? The example of God is constantly set before us for imitation. "Be ye merciful, even as your Father which is in heaven is merciful." "Forgive as ye are forgiven." "Be ye followers, imitators, of God, as dear children." The incarnation is possible because man by nature, though now perverted and depraved, is essentially akin to God.

And on the other hand man is able to hear and obey the call of God because he was made in the image of God. If there were nothing of the Godlike in man, God would appeal to man in vain. The Scripture constantly addresses man as lost. Sin is not his natural state. It is unnatural, abnormal. Man comes to himself only when he turns to God. The whole force of the term

*lost* lies in the thought that man has left his Father. To be lost is to be away from home. We have wandered. There lies the guilt, there too lies the hopefulness, of our condition. If we were created sinners, or if God had thrust us out, there would be no hope for us. He has not forsaken us, we have forsaken Him, therefore is there room for repentance and return. Men are capable of becoming the sons of God by grace because they are the sons of God by nature. Here also it is true—"Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. 15:46). We can think like God. The student in every department of knowledge may say with the great astronomer, I am thinking God's thoughts after Him. God speaks to us in His works and in His Word, and by His Spirit; we speak to Him in prayer. We understand each other, we speak the same language. We scrutinize His works, we question His providence, we commune with His Spirit. Within our narrow sphere we reason as He reasons. We can feel like God, can hate sin and cherish righteousness, and answer His love with ours. We can will like God. He made us free, and He respects our freedom. We may say No to the Almighty, may respond to His warnings and appeals, The universe is yours, but you cannot have me. So far as God is made known to us, point by point and power by power the

human nature answers to the Divine, as the dew-drop mirrors the sun. Therefore are we commanded to love God with heart and soul and mind and strength. This truth of the natural sonship of man, though seldom affirmed, underlies and conditions the Scripture throughout, and especially the doctrine of redemption; making possible the gift of God to man, and the response of man to God.

(b) Providential.<sup>1</sup> Israel is distinguished from all other peoples, and called the son of God as the peculiar object of His love and care. This is the predominant, almost exclusive, use of the term in the Old Testament. It appears for the first time in Exodus 4 : 22: "Thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, my first-born," and is found occasionally in the historical books (Deut. 1 : 31 ; 8 : 5). "Is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? He hath made thee and established thee" (Deut. 32 : 6). "Ye are the children of the Lord your God. . . . For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth"; (Deut. 14 : 1, 2) and in the Psalms (73 : 15); and more frequently in the Prophets. "But now, O Lord, thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our Father, and all are the work of thy hand" (Is. 64 : 8). "For thou art our Father,

<sup>1</sup> See Dalman's *Words of Jesus*, p. 184.

## 74 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us : thou, O Lord, art our Father ; our Redeemer from everlasting is thy name" (Is. 63 : 16). "I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born" (Jer. 31 : 9). "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt" (Hosea 11 : 1). "Have we not all one Father ? Hath not one God created us ?" (Mal. 2 : 10). "If then I be a father, where is mine honor ?" (Mal. 1 : 6). The ground of the relation is obviously God's choice of Israel to be a people peculiar to Himself, and the special providence which He exercised towards them. It was a national relation. There is probably no instance in the Old Testament in which God is spoken of as the Father of an individual, except in the case of an official representative of the people, like Solomon (2 Sam. 7 : 14—"I will be his Father, and he shall be my son"). The individual was related to God through the theocracy.<sup>1</sup> This mode of conceiving of the individual only as a member of the state was characteristic of the ancient world. Jesus first gave his rightful place to man, for whose welfare the Sabbath, the state, the church, all civil and social institutions, are ordained. He has been termed "the discoverer of the individual." God was the Father, as He was the Husband, of the nation. So deeply rooted in the Jewish mind was this conception of God and His

<sup>1</sup> See Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy*, 69.

relation to man that in the Gospels twice only is the name Father uttered by merely human lips. Both instances are in John. In 8:41 the Jews affirm, We have one Father, even God, where the national, theocratic relation is evidently meant; in 14:8 Philip prays, Shew us the Father. In both instances the word is caught directly from the lips of Jesus. As the natural relation, so the providential relation has been broken and its privileges have been forfeited by the sin, especially by the unbelief, of the Jews, and God is no longer regarded as their Father when they reject His Son. They are expressly disowned; are no longer the children of God, but the children of the devil. "If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I came forth and am come from God. . . . Ye are of your father, the devil" (8:42, 44). Even in the case of natural descent, indeed, sonship is denied to those who have not the spirit of their father. "I know that ye are Abraham's seed. . . . If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. . . . Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day" (8:37, 39, 56). Here the higher and lower forms of sonship are clearly distinguished. In the lower sense it is constituted by natural descent, in the higher by moral affinity. Ye are, ye are not, the sons of Abraham. In the same sense it may be said that men are, and that men are not, the sons of

## 76 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

God ; His because begotten of Him ; not His, because not in sympathy with Him. They have the nature, but not the spirit, of sons.

(c) Gracious. God is the Father of those who believe upon His Son and are born of His Spirit. This is the predominant, almost exclusive, use of the term in the New Testament. Wherever in the Gospels Jesus says, Your Father, He is addressing His disciples. Men may call God Father when they are prepared to render Him the obedience of sons. This highest sense of the term, in which alone its full meaning is attained, is characteristically the only one recognized by John. Men become the children of God through Christ alone (1 : 12), and enter His kingdom only through the new birth (3 : 5). Christ is Son of God by nature, men become sons of God by grace. In the discourses of our Lord the *Father* is often interchanged with *My Father*, and signifies *the Father of Me and Mine*. The only instance in the Gospel where the term may seem to require a broader meaning and to be applied to all men is in 4 : 23—"The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be His worshippers." Yet here too in accord with the context and with the general tenor of the Gospel, *the Father* can mean only the Father of all those, whether Jews or Samaritans, who are prepared to worship Him in

spirit and in truth. Local and national distinctions are done away, and all men may render Him filial reverence and obedience. Caiaphas the high priest prophesied "that Jesus should die for the nation ; and not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad" (11 : 51, 52). Jesus said, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold : them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice ; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd" (10 : 16). They are meant who are of God, and therefore hear the words of God (8 : 47); who are of the truth, and therefore hear the voice of Jesus (18 : 37)—that is, those in whom there is a susceptibility to the truth, a desire for righteousness, a turning of the soul towards God, begotten of His Spirit, which will lead them to receive Christ when He is made known.

It must be said then that the general conception of Fatherhood by nature underlies the Scripture representation of the relation between God and man, and especially the doctrines of the incarnation and redemption. On the other hand this relation is everywhere subordinated in Scripture to the ethical relation which God seeks to establish with men. In the Old Testament God is almost always represented as the Father of Israel, in distinction from other nations; and in the New Testament ordinarily, and in John ex-

## 78 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

clusively, as the Father of those who believe on His Son, in distinction from the unbelieving world. The relation of sonship is realized only in the experience of Jesus and His disciples. Sonship by nature is of value as the basis of sonship by grace. John, recognizing only the higher form of the relation, teaches not that men are the children of God by nature, but that they become the children of God by grace. He who refuses to receive the Son severs, so far as he may, his relation to God, repudiates the obligations of sonship, is false to that moral nature in which he is most nearly akin to God. Therefore John will not acknowledge him a son. The breadth of the teaching of the New Testament, in contrast with the Old, lies in the fact that sonship is no longer national and formal, constituted by birth and circumcision, but personal and vital, constituted by faith and the new birth; and is brought therefore within the reach of every man. Yet it must not be forgotten that under the old covenant also, though God manifested His grace most abundantly to Israel, the Spirit wrought where He listed, and came upon Melchisedec as truly as upon Abraham.

Thrice glorified is our nature, by the creation of the Father, by the incarnation of the Son, by the indwelling of the Spirit.

Thus Jesus' designation of God as Father threw new light at once upon His character and

upon His relation to men. The prevailing conception of the Old Testament is the sovereignty of God, of the New Testament the fatherhood of God. They are in no wise inconsistent. The later term includes the earlier. All that is essential to the sovereign belongs to the father. Civil government is ordained of God, but the forms that it assumes are artificial and conventional, creatures of society ; the authority of the father is rooted in nature, and he rules by divine right. In the beginning the father was priest and king. Obedience is the first duty of the son, and to honor father and mother has a place among the commandments which are the foundation of society. To call God Father is not to divest Him of His authority, but to place it on the surest foundation. Authority is as characteristic of the father as of the king. “A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master : if then I be a father, where is mine honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts” (Mal. 1: 6). “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven ; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven” (Matt. 7: 21). “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love ; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love” (15: 10). “This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments” (1 John 5: 3). But beyond the au-

thority of the sovereign God exercises towards men the care and love of a father. His relation to them is no longer mediated through church or state, but is direct and personal. He enters into immediate and vital fellowship with every man who will receive Him. He rules the world, therefore He is King; He enters the individual life, therefore He is Father. The King governs by general laws, the Father by personal influence. As His relation to the individual is more clearly disclosed, the Father takes precedence of the King. God is Father because God is love. This is the thought of Jesus, and in proportion as men share His spirit they find in God their Father.

God reveals Himself in many ways, leaves no way untried, seeks entrance to the hearts of men through every avenue of sense and spirit, knocks at every door of our nature. The old theologians were accustomed to say that He is made known by way of causality, as the great First Cause of all things (Rom. 1: 20); by way of eminence, as exhibiting all that is good in the highest degree; by way of negation, as free from all limitation and imperfection (see Thos. Aquinas 1: 13, 10 at end). This is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture, yet these general considerations are thrust unto the background in the doctrine of John, as of the New Testament throughout, by the crowning and all-comprehensive revelation which is given in Jesus Christ. The emphasis of John's

teaching falls upon two points. (*a*) The spirit in which the divine revelation must be received. That revelation is not outward and sensible, but inward and spiritual. It is addressed to the understanding, the heart, the conscience, the will, appeals to the whole man. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" (Mark 12:30). It is the whole nature of man that is created in the image of God, it is the whole nature of man that must lay hold of God. To receive Him is to know Him with the understanding, love Him with the heart, obey Him with the will. Because He is love He cannot be known by the intellect alone; because He is truth he cannot be grasped by the affections alone; because He is holy He cannot be apprehended without the effort of the will. Our nature in every particular must answer to His, must render docility to His wisdom, love to His love, obedience to His will. The whole man is required to know God. The truth is apprehended therefore only as there is an inner susceptibility, sympathy, readiness to obey. Obedience is the organ of knowledge. "If any man willetteth to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak from myself" (7:17). "He that is of God kareth the words of God" (8:47). "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (18:37). Every man whose supreme

concern it is to know and obey the truth responds to the voice of Him who is the truth. The truth is made known to men in proportion as they are prepared to receive it. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now" (16: 12). They were able neither to understand nor to obey. "While ye have the light, believe on the light, that ye may become the sons of light" (12: 36). The light shines for all, "lighteth every man" (1: 9), but they only are enlightened who believe on the light. The light is darkness to the blind. Truth is given for sanctification—"Sanctify them in the truth" (17: 17), and is unfolded therefore as men are in sympathy with it and are prepared to submit their lives to its power. Spiritual truth is not known until it is obeyed. "Hereby know we that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2: 3, 4). "He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love" (1 John 4: 8). "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments" (1 John 5: 3). "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me" (14: 21). In his note on 1 John 4: 18, Bengel has admirably represented the place of love in the life of the soul: without fear, without love—the soul indifferent; with fear, without love—the soul awakened; with fear, with love—the

soul renewed; without fear, with love—the soul made perfect. The germ of the thought is found in Augustine, Hom. on 1 John 9:4.

(6) The sufficient and complete revelation of God is given in His Son, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead in bodily form.

This leads us to the study of the life and character and teaching of Jesus Christ.

### III

#### THE WORD—HIS NATURE

THE term Word in this personal sense is peculiar to John. It occurs only in the prologue of the Gospel, in 1 John 1, where it seems to include both the person and the gospel of Christ, which indeed are one; and in Revelation 19: 13—"His name is called the Word of God." Christ is the Word as He is the revelation of God. Speech is the readiest interpreter of thought. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" (Matt. 12: 34). Therefore "by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned" (Matt. 12: 37). The tongue betrays the heart. In 8: 43 *λόγος* is contrasted with *λαλιά*. *λαλιά* is mere vocal utterance, *λόγος* is speech as the vehicle of thought. *λαλιά* may be used of animals, but not *λόγος*. The one is the form, the other the matter of speech. By the manner of speech the antecedents of the speaker are discovered. To Peter it was said, "Thy speech," *λαλιά*, dialect, "betrayeth thee" (Matt. 26: 73). Jesus said to the Jews, "Why do ye not understand my speech"—*λαλιάν*—catch the divine tone, the accent of heaven? "Because

ye do not hear my word"—λόγον—do not apprehend the meaning of my message (8: 43).

In so far as it is sincere, speech is a true though inadequate disclosure of character. The tongue is a clumsy instrument of the spirit. The profoundest emotions are never clothed in words; in its deepest experiences the soul is dumb; yet thought and feeling are ever striving to find expression in speech. This too is of God. Natural gifts are divine endowments. Since God is truth, His word is the absolute and perfect expression of His nature. But no language can contain the thought or image the perfections of Him for whom the heavens are too small. The Word of God is a life kindred to His own. In the Old Testament God revealed Himself imperfectly in terms of speech; in the New Testament He reveals Himself perfectly in terms of life.

If we seek the origin of the title, *Logos*, we must distinguish between the *term* and the *thought* that it conveys. The *term* was in familiar use in the current speculations of the time. John borrowed it, transferred it from philosophy to religion; and like Paul at Athens, proclaiming the Unknown God, unveiled the truth enshrined in the word. This *Logos* of which you speak, behold it incarnate in Jesus Christ. The *thought* expressed by the term is deeply rooted in the Old Testament, the common source from which John and Philo drew. Philo developed it phil-

## 86 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

osophically, under the guidance of Plato ; John historically, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. That the *λόγος* of Philo has striking points of analogy with the *λόγος* of John is manifest, but the points of difference are no less striking. The teaching of Philo is vague, confused, uncertain, while John walks with assured step amid these high mysteries. *Generically* the *λόγος* of Philo differs from that of John because it signifies not the Word but the Reason of God. Nowhere in the New Testament does *λόγος* signify reason, not even in Hebrews 4 : 12, "for the word of God is quick and powerful," where it is so rendered in Thayer's Lexicon. *Specifically* it differs in three main particulars. (a) It is impersonal. This remains the more probable opinion, after all that has been written upon a question so vexed and difficult. And indeed the very fact that the question is raised shows how widely the philosopher differs from the evangelist. (b) It is not incarnate. With Philo's doctrine of the inherent evil of matter, it was impossible that the divine reason should become flesh. The *λόγος* of Philo emphasizes the separation of God from the world ; the *λόγος* of John reveals God immanent in the world from the beginning, now manifest in the flesh. (c) It is not Messianic. The truths of sin and salvation had little place in Philo's system, and the hope of the Messiah if not lost had grown dim. Creation

therefore, but not redemption, is ascribed by Philo to the word; while redemption through the Word is the central thought of the Gospel.

Three distinct lines of preparation in the Old Testament converge upon the doctrine of the Word. (*a*) The word of God is represented as the instrument of His power, the revelation of His will. To it are ascribed, as here to the personal Word: eternity—"Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven" (Ps. 119: 89. Compare Is. 40: 8—"The word of our God shall stand forever"); creation—"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made" (Ps. 33: 6; Gen. 1); illumination—"Thy word is a lamp unto my feet" (Ps. 119: 105, 130); redemption (Ps. 19: 7-11; Ps. 119 passim; Is. 55: 11). The word of Jehovah came to the prophets, and was seen by them (Is. 2: 1; Micah 1: 1). It is profoundly true alike of the physical and the spiritual nature of man that he does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. The doctrine of the word was developed by the Rabbis, and in the Targums the Memra, or word of Jehovah, is a frequent paraphrase of the divine name.

(*b*) Wisdom, especially as personified in the book of Proverbs, chapters eight and nine (compare Job 28). To it are ascribed, as here to the Word: eternity—"The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of

## 88 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

old : I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was " (Prov. 8 : 22, 23) ; creation—" The Lord by wisdom founded the earth " (Prov. 3 : 19 ; Ps. 136 : 5 ; Jer. 10 : 12 ; 51 : 15. In Prov. 8 : 30 wisdom is termed a " master workman ") ; illumination—" Counsel is mine and sound knowledge " (Prov. 8 : 14) ; loving intimacy with God—" I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him (Prov. 8 : 30. Compare Prov. 30 : 4—" What is his son's name? ") ; dwelling with men—" Rejoicing in his habitable earth ; and my delight was with the sons of men " (Prov. 8 : 31) ; redemption— " She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her " (Prov. 3 : 18), " Whoso findeth me findeth life " (Prov. 8 : 35, 36). In the Apocryphal books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus wisdom is further personified ; and in Luke 11 : 49 according to the most probable interpretation Christ calls Himself the wisdom of God. In the Book of Enoch 90 : 38, the Messiah is called the Word, but the passage is generally rejected by the critics.

(c) The mysterious being called the angel of Jehovah, of the Covenant, of the Presence, who appears at intervals throughout the Old Scripture from Genesis to Malachi ; and is at once identified with Jehovah and distinguished from Him (Gen. 16 : 7, 13 ; 48 : 15, 16 ; Ex. 3 : 2, 4, 6 ; Is. 63 : 9 ; Mal. 3 : 1). Whether that angel was a

creature acting in the name and by the authority of Jehovah, or the Second Person of the Trinity assuming visible form, which is the more probable opinion (see Hastings' B. D. Art. *Angels II*), in either case is prefigured the incarnation of the Word. Every theophany is a foreshadowing of Christ come in the flesh. To these anticipations of the Word must be added of course the prophecies in which His advent and character are directly foretold and portrayed, culminating in the vivid picture of Is. 53.

The general truth underlying all these representations is that God reveals Himself mediately, and that the medium of all revelation in nature and in grace is the Word. The word of man is the partial and inadequate expression of the inner life; the Word of God is the complete and perfect disclosure of the divine nature. Thus the prologue of the Gospel, which of all parts of the New Testament may appear at first glance most alien in form and spirit from the Old Scripture, is seen to strike its roots deep down into the history, the law, the prophecy of the earlier dispensation, and the Word of John is one with the Jehovah of Moses. The creative and prophetic word reaches its full and final expression in the Word incarnate. In Christ God has magnified His word above all His name (Ps. 138: 2); has given the highest revelation of His nature and His will.

Through the Word a threefold revelation has been granted to men. (*a*) To all mankind in His works of creation and providence, and in the common operations of His Spirit. "All things were made by him." "Between the speaking of God and the making of the creature," said Augustine, "what was there by which it was made but the Word?" "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." He "lighteth every man." We must never lose sight of this primal relation which the Word sustains to His intelligent creatures. True and weighty are the words of Lightfoot: "The creative and administrative work of Christ the Word in the natural order of things is always emphasized in the writings of the apostles, when they touch upon the doctrine of His Person. It stands in the forefront of the prologue of St. John's Gospel; it is hardly less prominent in the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews. His mediatorial function in the Church is represented as flowing from His mediatorial function in the world. With ourselves this idea has retired very much into the background. Though in the creed common to all the churches we profess our belief in Him as the Being 'through whom all things were created,' yet in reality this confession seems to exercise very little influence on our thoughts, and the loss is serious. How much our theological conceptions suffer in breadth and fulness by

the neglect, a moment's reflection will show. How much more hearty would be the sympathy of theologians with the revelations of science and the developments of history, if they habitually connected them with the operation of the same divine Word who is the centre of all their religious aspirations, it is needless to say. Through the recognition of this idea with all the consequences which flow from it, as a living influence, more than in any other way, may we hope to strike the chords of that 'vaster music,' which results only from the harmony of knowledge and faith, and reverence and research" (Com. on Col. Introd. III). He made the world, He loves the world, He died for the world ; the world is His. He rules it, He shall redeem it. We must not suffer His relation to the Church to obscure this larger relation to mankind. His purpose to save the elect is part of a vaster purpose that embraces the universe.

(b) Specially to the Jews as "*his own*" (I : 11). He was the head of the Old Testament Church as He is the head of the New Testament Church. "They drank of a spiritual rock that followed them ; and the rock was Christ" (I Cor. 10 : 4). Verse nine of the same chapter—"neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted,"—should read, as in the Revised Version, which yet places *Christ* in the margin, "neither let us tempt *the Lord*," i. e., God. In designating the

## 92 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

Jews as *His own*, the Gospel ascribes to the Word the covenant relation of Jehovah to His people. He is also termed the bridegroom (3: 29), a familiar Old Testament figure to represent the relation of God to Israel. Of Him Moses and the prophets wrote (1: 45 ; 5: 39, 46), His day Abraham rejoiced to see (8: 56), His glory Isaiah saw (12: 41). Thus the gnostic conception is overthrown, prevalent in the days of John, that the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New are distinct and antagonistic.

(c) His manifestation in the flesh. This revelation, granted of necessity to few in the beginning, is designed for the race, so that the words with which David describes the disclosure of God in nature Paul applies to the preaching of the gospel—" Their sound went out into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world " Rom. (10: 18). The prophets spake to Israel, the apostles were sent into all the earth. Revelation, compressed for a time within the limits of a single people, resumes its original form, and is addressed to mankind.

Observe the growing clearness of the revelation. In the creation His eternal power and Godhead are disclosed; in the Old Testament His will and the promise of the Savior; in the New Testament His grace and truth, the law and the promise fulfilled.

The Word then is the sole and sufficient reve-

lation of God. Through Him only is God known. Every disclosure of the divine nature, in creation, in providence, in grace, in the Old Testament and the New, to the world, to the Jew, to the believer, is made through Him. He is the Word of God, the light and life of men. Not to believe upon Him is to abide in darkness (12:46). "No one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him" (Matt. 11:27). "No one cometh unto the Father, but by me" (14:6). "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (1:18). In commenting on these words Chrysostom cites several passages from the Scripture in which men are said to have seen God, and asks, "How then saith John, no man hath seen God at any time? It is to declare that all these were instances of (his) condescension, not the vision of the essence itself unveiled. For had they seen the very nature, they would not have beheld it under different forms, since that is simple, without form, or parts, or bounding lines. It sits not, nor stands, nor walks; these things belong all to bodies. But how he is, he only knoweth."

In the first verse of the Gospel three predicates are ascribed to the Word.

(a) He was "in the beginning." "That

which was from the beginning" (1 John 1:1). With these words Moses introduces the story of creation and John the story of redemption. Since by Him all things were made (1:4), He existed before the creation; and if not created He is eternal. (See Lightfoot's note on the term *first-born of all creation*, Col. 1:15.) The eternity of God is similarly expressed by reference to the creation in Ps. 90:2—"Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." The Word was not only *in* the beginning, He *is* the beginning—"the beginning of the creation of God" (Rev. 3:14). "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end" (Rev. 21:6; 22:13). He is the First Cause and the Final Cause of the Creation, for "all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist" (Col. 1:16). If with the fathers generally, Westcott and Hort, the margin of the Revised Version, and the American revisers, we place a period after οὐδὲ ἐν in 1:3, so as to read, "Without him was not anything made. That which hath been made was life in him," the Word is represented as not only the maker but the life-giver and preserver of the universe, "upholding all things by the word of his power" (Heb. 1:3). But the combination of the perfect γέγονεν with ἦν

is so singular that some early authorities substitute  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  for  $\eta\nu$ . Moreover by this pointing the sentence is rendered harsh and obscure. On internal grounds therefore the usual punctuation with the period after  $\gamma\acute{e}yov\acute{e}\nu$  is to be preferred. The truth is stated after John's manner positively and negatively, and with emphatic fulness of phrase. The difficult passage (8:25), which the Revised Version renders, in substantial accord with the Authorized Version, "They said therefore unto him, Who art thou? Jesus said unto them, Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning"—is interpreted by Augustine with his wonted ingenuity. "What did they say to him? 'Who art thou?' For when thou saidst, If ye believe not that I am; thou didst not tell us what thou wert. Who art thou, that we may believe? He answered, the Beginning. . . . For just as if by saying, Who art thou? they had said nothing else than this, What shall we believe thee to be? He replied, The Beginning; that is, Believe me (to be) the Beginning . . . and he added: for (as such) I also speak to you; that is, having humbled myself on your account, I have condescended to such words. . . . Therefore, said he, believe me to be the beginning; for, that you may believe, I not only am, but also speak to you" (Com. in loc.). For the present margin which reads, "How is it that I even speak to you

at all?" and might well be omitted, the American revisers substitute, "Altogether that which I also speak unto you," which is probably the best rendering yet suggested, though none is free from difficulty.

The purpose of redemption was formed in that eternity in which God dwelt alone. "He chose us in him before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4). In Rev. 13:8 it is uncertain whether we should read "written in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world," or with the margin of the Revised Version, and the American revisers, "written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain." The gospel records the unfolding of this eternal purpose in time. "Christ, . . . who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake" (1 Peter 1:20). "Who saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before times eternal, but hath now been manifested by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ" (2 Tim. 1:9, 10).

Jesus declared His preexistence in explicit terms. "Before Abraham was, I am" (8:58), "The glory which I had with thee before the world was" (17:5). The Eternal Father has an

Eternal Son. "Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world" (17:24). In the light of these passages must be interpreted the phrases, "He descended from heaven" (3:13, 31) "ascending where he was before" (6:62). To the same effect is the witness of John the Baptist. He holds a prominent place in the opening chapter, for in him, as in Moses and Elijah on the Mount, the old dispensation rendered homage to Christ. The enigmatic form of his witness was adapted to awaken interest and arrest attention—"after me cometh a man which is become before me; for he was before me" (1:30). Some interpret his words of time only, and others of rank only; but the true interpretation embraces both. He who came after me in time, entering later upon His ministry, is in honor preferred before me, because from eternity He was before me. His priority in rank is unique because it is based upon His priority in time, while yet He appeared later upon the scene. In respect to His human nature subsequent to John, He takes precedence by virtue of His divine nature.

A striking contrast between John the Baptist and Jesus, the voice and the Word, suggested by Origen (On John, Bk. 2:26), is drawn out by Augustine with great force and skill. "A word is something even without a voice, for a word in the heart is as truly a word as after it is out-spoken; while a voice is nothing, a mere un-

## 98 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

meaning sound, an empty cry, unless it be also the vehicle of a word. But when they are thus united, the voice in a manner goes before the word, for the sound strikes the ear before the sense is conveyed to the mind ; yet while it thus goes before it in this act of communication, it is *not* really before it, but the contrary. Thus, when we speak, the word in our hearts must precede the voice on our lips, which voice is yet the vehicle by which the word in us is transferred to, and becomes also a word in, another ; but this being accomplished, or rather in the very accomplishment of this, the voice has passed away, exists no more ; but the word which is planted now in the other's heart, no less than in our own, abides. All this Augustine transfers to the Lord and to His forerunner. John is nothing without Jesus ; Jesus just what before He was without John : however to men the knowledge of Him may have come through John. John the first in time, and yet He who *came* after, most truly having *been* before, him. John so soon as he had accomplished his mission, passing away, having no continual significance for the Church of God ; but Jesus, of whom he had told, and to whom he witnessed, abiding forever" (quoted from Trench, *N. T. Syn.*, § 89).

The arguments by which such scholars as Beyschlag and Wendt attempt to prove that Jesus taught only His ideal preexistence, in the

thought and purpose of God, are refuted by the simple fact that such language is never employed by men or concerning men in Scripture, though they too have a place in the divine plan even before their birth. "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee" (Jer. 1:5). Compare the prophecies relating to John the Baptist. It is only necessary to set these two classes of passages side by side to see how wide is the difference between them. Sir Thomas Browne says, "Before Abraham was, I am, is the saying of Christ; yet it is true in some sense if I say it of myself; for I was not only before myself, but Adam, that is in the idea of God, and the decree of that synod held from all eternity" (*Rel. Med.* 1:59). There is no before or after in the divine mind to which all time is present. In the words, "Before Abraham was, I am," we catch the echo of Exodus 3:14, "I am that I am." The change of the verb, Abraham *was*, I *am*, the use of the personal pronoun, and the contrast with the historic figure of Abraham, all point unmistakably to the personal preexistence of the Word.

(b) He was with God. The phrase  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \tau\delta\varsigma$   $\vartheta\epsilon\circ\gamma$  denotes not a passive but an active relation, not mere abiding with, but the direction of the nature towards, intercourse, communion. The combination of the preposition of motion with

ἥν indicates that this tendency towards God is the permanent state of the Word, who is ever proceeding from Him and ever returning to Him. In 1:18 the thought is conveyed by the phrase *in the bosom of the Father*. Similar expressions are found in 13:23—"There was at the table reclining on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved," and Luke 16:22, 23—"And it came to pass that the beggar died, and that he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom"—the rich man "seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom"; and denote intimacy, affection, and dependence. "The eternal life, which was *with the Father*" (1 John 1:2). The names given to the Second Person of the Trinity are drawn from His relation to the First Person—Word, Son.

(c) He was God. The Personality of the Word is declared. His Deity, conspicuous throughout the Gospel, is expressly affirmed. θεὸς stands emphatically first. The unity of nature in the Godhead is disclosed, and the distinction of Persons. He who was with God is God. To be adequate the Word must be divine. The only perfect mirror of God is God. He is the effulgence of the Father's glory, and the very image of His substance (Heb. 1:3). "Accordingly, as though uttering Himself, the Father begat the Word equal to Himself in all things; for He would not have uttered Himself wholly and

perfectly, if there were in His Word anything more or less than in Himself" (*Augustine, On the Trinity*, 15 : 14). The only other instance in the Gospel in which the Word is explicitly called God is in 20: 28—"Thomas said unto him, my Lord and my God"; homage which Jesus accepted without rebuke. The text of 1: 18—"The only begotten Son," or "God only begotten"—is too doubtful both upon internal and external grounds to sustain an argument. There are few passages in the New Testament in which the evidence on either side is so nearly balanced, and it is impossible to pronounce with confidence in favor of either reading. For *uios* see Ezra Abbot, *Critical Essays*; for *theos*, Hort, *Two Dissertations*. The attributes of deity are ascribed to the Word in relation to the universe, of which He is the maker; to men, of whom He is the light and life; and to the Jews, who are His own.

It is evident therefore that Jesus is termed the Son of God upon the ground of an eternal relation. The title will be examined at length in the chapter following. But it is further true that the ethical relation is more frequently if not more emphatically presented. In 8: 42—"I came forth and am come from God"—*ek tou theou*—Jesus is not speaking of a metaphysical relation but of a historical fact; not of His eternal generation but of His incarnation. I came forth

from Him, sent by Him, and am here in obedience to His will. Of similar tenor are the phrases *to come forth παρὰ* (16: 27) and *ἀπὸ θεοῦ* (13: 3; 16: 30). The prepositions denote different forms of relationship, but no one of them requires the meaning, *came forth from the being of God* (Winer, *N. T. Grammar*, § 47). In 16: 28—"I came out from (*ἐκ*) the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go unto the Father"—it is again His historical mission of which He speaks. *I came into the world* is parallel with *I leave the world*, and *I came forth from the Father* is parallel with *I go unto the Father*. The metaphysical relation must be deduced from the historical fact. Men must recognize that He is sent from God before they will believe that He is born of God.

He is the only begotten Son of the Father. "Do you ask of me whether the Son were born? I answer 'born.' For He would not be a son if not born. So when I say the Son always was, I say in fact 'was always born.' And who understands was always born? Give me an eternal fire, and I will give thee an eternal brightness" (Augustine).

Ordinarily when the subordination of the Son is alluded to in the Gospel, the reference is to His estate of humiliation. "The Father who is greater than all (10: 29) is greater than I" (14: 28). How much more than man must He

be who thought it needful to own Himself less than God. In assuming our nature the Eternal Son was made "a little lower than the angels" (Heb. 2: 9). But that temporal subordination rests upon an eternal subordination which lies in the titles *Word* and *Son*. The Son may become subject to the Father because He was always subordinate to the Father. In the happy phrase of Hilary of Poitiers He is inferior to the Father *generatione* but not *genere*. Paul compares the relation of Father and Son to the relation of husband and wife. "The head of every man is Christ: and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11: 3). Man and woman are of the same nature (Gen. 1: 27), equal in Christ (Gal. 3: 28), yet the woman is subordinate to the man. The Father and the Son are the same in substance, equal in power and glory, yet the Son is subordinate to the Father. If these representations of the Scripture be set side by side, they can be reconciled only by the doctrine of the essential equality and personal subordination of the Son. The Word eternally proceeds from God, the Son is eternally begotten of the Father. *The Word was with God* distinguishes the Son from the Father; *the Word was God* identifies Him with the Father. They are one in nature, distinct in Person. This is the truth clearly taught in 10: 30—"I and the Father are one." "He said not, I am the

Father; or, I and the Father *is* one person; but when he says, I and the Father are one, hear both, both the one, *unum*, and the are, *sumus*, and thou shalt be delivered both from Charybdis and from Scylla. In these two words, in that He said *one*, He delivers thee from Arius; in that He said *are*, He delivers thee from Sabellius. If *one*, therefore not diverse; if *are*, therefore both Father and Son. For He would not say *are* of one person; but on the other hand, He would not say *one* of diverse" (*Augustine, Tract. on John 36:9*). To the same effect see Ambrose, *On the Holy Spirit* 3: 116, 117, Tertullian, *Against Praxeas* 22, Hippolytus, *Against Noetus* 7.

How profound was the impression made by the life and teaching of Jesus upon this pious Jew, whose Epistles and Apocalypse evince such lofty conceptions of God and righteousness, that he accepted and recorded claims like these. In the prologue of the Gospel and in the Apocalypse he exalts Jesus to the throne of God. The very fact that the disciples came so slowly to apprehend the significance of Jesus' claims indicates how alien were those claims from their traditions, their prejudices, their customary modes of thought, and how strong was the evidence that compelled belief. The bosom friend of Jesus rendered Him the loftiest honor. Ignorance is the mother of superstition, knowledge is the mother of devotion.

## IV

### THE WORD—HIS EARTHLY MISSION

THIS is the theme of the Gospel. Jesus is God's revelation to man, God's sacrifice for man. To deny that He is come in the flesh is the mark of antichrist (1 John 4:2, 3; 2 John 7); for through the flesh the revelation is made, the sacrifice is offered. He suffered as man that He might redeem as God. God could not die, man could not redeem. That He might die and redeem, He must be both God and man.

We may consider the *Manner* and the *Purpose* of His coming.

1. *The Manner of His coming.*—“The Word became flesh.” The story of His birth, related at length by Matthew and Luke, is compressed into a phrase. *σάρξ* in the usage of John signifies (*α*) literally, the soft parts of the body. “Flesh and bones” (Luke 24:39; Rev. 17:16; 19:18, 21). It is used figuratively in 6:51ff. To eat the flesh and drink the blood of Jesus is to partake of the benefits of His sacrifice. In 6:63 flesh is contrasted with spirit. “It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are

spirit, and are life." It is not the feeding upon My body but the appropriation of the truth that gives life. (b) The animal, sensuous nature of man. In 1:13 it is opposed to *ἀνήρ* as the sensual to the rational: "which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Sensual desire is the lust of the flesh (1 John 2:16). (c) Human nature in its entirety. It is by the flesh that man is distinguished from other rational creatures. In contrast with the lower animals he is spirit; in contrast with the angels he is flesh. Regarded from above he is flesh, regarded from beneath he is spirit—"half dust, half Deity." Flesh may signify therefore man fallen, as spirit signifies man renewed. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (3:6). *All flesh* is all mankind (17:2). When Jesus said to the Pharisees, "Ye judge after the flesh" (8:15), He did not mean, you judge Me after your own carnal nature, but you judge merely by My bodily appearance, that which meets the eye; and therefore regard Me only as man. "Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment" (7:24).

To become flesh is to become man. "After me cometh *a man* which is preferred before me" (1:30). "But now ye seek to kill me, *a man* that hath told you the truth" (8:40). But flesh forms a clearer antithesis to spirit, and gives

prominence to His humiliation. He was pure spirit, He became flesh. The term represents man on the side of his weakness and frailty, designates him by his lower and mortal part. "My spirit shall not strive with man forever, for that he also is flesh" (Gen. 6: 3). But man's nature, flesh and spirit alike, is of God, and no part of it is originally or inherently corrupt. The flesh is necessarily weak—"the body of our humiliation" (Phil. 3: 21), but not necessarily sinful. It is not sin, but the seat of sin (Rom. 7: 17, 18). It is actually and universally, but not primarily or essentially, corrupt, and therefore the Word could come in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet remain pure. "Thus the idea of evil attaches to the flesh not in virtue of what it is essentially, but from the undue preponderance which is given to it. The flesh serves for the manifestation of character. It ministers to other powers. It becomes evil when it is made supreme or dominates. It does not include the idea of sinfulness, but it describes human personality on the side which tends to sin, and on which we actually have sinned" (Westcott on Epistles of John. Additional note on 1 John 3: 19. The whole note will repay study).

In becoming flesh He assumed not a human body alone, but human nature, body (2: 21; 19: 38), soul (10: 15; 12: 27), and spirit (11: 33; 13: 21; 19: 30). The personality of the Word

was not lost or impaired by reason of the change. He who dwelt in the flesh among men is He who dwelt in glory with the Father before the world was. He added the human nature to the divine. "When therefore he had said, 'born of God,' lest we should, as it were, be filled with amazement and trembling at such grace, at grace so great as to exceed belief, that men are born of God, as if assuring thee, he says, 'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' Why then dost thou marvel that men are born of God? Consider God Himself born of men" (Augustine on John, Tract. 2:15).

Man does not cease to be man in becoming the son of God; the Word does not cease to be God in becoming the Son of man. The two natures form one Person. To the Incarnate Word are ascribed both divine attributes and human experiences, and the qualities of both natures are referred to the one Person. The union of two natures in one Person is as inscrutable as the union of three Persons in one nature. The dual nature of man affords no analogy, for nature in that case signifies not substance but disposition. We have one nature, which is partly good and partly evil, as in the body the tendencies to health and disease subsist side by side. John of Damascus makes use of a striking figure, suggested by Origen (*De Prin.* 2:6, 6). "Take the case of the flaming sword; just as in it the natures of

the fire and the steel are preserved distinct, so also are their two energies and their effects. For the energy of the steel is its cutting power, and that of the fire is its burning power, and the cut is the effect of the energy of the steel, and the burn is the effect of the energy of the fire ; and these are kept quite distinct in the burned cut, and in the cut burn, although neither does the burning take place apart from the cut after the union of the two, nor the cut apart from the burning ; and we do not maintain on account of the twofold natural energy that there are two flaming swords, nor do we confuse the essential difference of the energies on account of the unity of the flaming sword. In like manner also in the case of Christ his divinity possesses an energy that is divine and omnipotent, while his humanity has an energy such as is our own" (*On the Orthodox Faith* 3: 15). "Should any one pour water over flaming steel, it is that which naturally suffers by the water, I mean the fire, that is quenched, but the steel remains untouched (for it is not the nature of steel to be destroyed by water) ; much more then when the flesh suffered did his only passionless divinity escape all passion although abiding inseparable from it" (*Id.* 3: 26). Through grace He is humbled that by grace man may be exalted.

Having assumed the nature of man, He dwelt, *tabernacled*, among men. The thought of *tran-*

*sient* sojourn originally suggested by the word finds no place in the usage of John. He employs it elsewhere only in the Apocalypse, where it is applied to the abode of God with His people and of the redeemed in heaven (7:15; 12:12; 13:6; 21:3). He is Immanuel, God with us. The visible presence of God among men, prefigured in the tabernacle and the temple, is realized in Him. "We beheld his glory"—primarily, we the apostles; then those "that believe on his name" (verse 12); now all believers in the mirror of the written Word—"We all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord" (2 Cor. 3:18, margin of the Revised Version, and American revisers. Comp. 2 Cor. 4:6). The word is here employed in contrast to the partial and fleeting theophanies of the Old Scripture. He did not simply appear to men and vanish, as under the earlier dispensation; He made His home with them.

The main teaching of the four Gospels respectively may be summed up in the words, Law, Power, Grace, Glory. John alone of the evangelists does not relate the story of the transfiguration, for the transfigured Christ illuminates every page. The glory of God is the outshining of the divine perfections, the manifestation of the divine excellence. Under the old covenant it was represented by the Shekinah, the light that symbolized and disclosed the presence of God with

Israel. Moses craved a clearer revelation, and prayed, "shew me thy glory" (Ex. 33:18). Isaiah saw the glory of God in his temple (ch. 6), and that glory was the glory of the Eternal Word (John 12:41). The glory of the Word is the glory of an only begotten Son, partaker of the Father's nature, heir of the Father's wealth—"whom he appointed heir of all things" (Heb. 1:2). In relation to God He is the only begotten; in relation to nature (Col. 1:15) and to His people (Rom. 8:29) He is the first-born. He is full of grace and truth, qualities in which His glory essentially consists.

In the law God *told* men, in Christ He *shows* men, what He is, comes down within their reach, where their eyes may see Him, their ears may hear, their hands may handle. Then His back was seen (Ex. 33:23), now His face (2 Cor. 4:6). The Word is God expressed. The Infinite Spirit becomes local and visible in Him. Because man could not rise to God, God descends to man. The Infinite assumes the form of the finite, that finite creatures may apprehend Him. God becomes flesh that flesh may know Him. He who has always been seeking to disclose Himself, revealing His wisdom and His power in the works of His hands, striving to utter Himself in rites and types and symbols under the old economy, clothing spiritual truth in sensible forms, found the clearest medium of revelation in a human

life. God may become man because man is God-like; man may know God in man as he could not know Him in any other form. If God assumes visible shape, He will take upon Him the form of man, because this is at once the most intelligible to men, and the nearest approach to the divine. "Thou hast made him but little lower than God" (Ps. 8:5). When the Divine Spirit condescends to a material dwelling-place, there is none besides so apt as that in which the human spirit is enshrined. The divine is translated into terms of human life and experience. He who is omnipresent and eternal submits to the limitations of space and time, because space and time are the conditions and the boundaries of human knowledge. By assuming flesh the Word became visible and tangible, susceptible of suffering and death.<sup>1</sup>

2. *The Purpose of His coming.*—It is expressed in various phrases. In general He came to do the will of God (5:30; 6:38; 7:18; 8:50). He did nothing of Himself (5:19); His teaching was not His own (7:16; 8:28, 40; 12:49, 50); His works were given Him of the Father (5:36); it was His meat to do the Father's will (4:34); and He sought only the Father's glory in life (7:18) and in

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Aquinas teaches that on the ground at once of dignity and necessity no other nature than the human could be assumed by the Word (3:4:1).

death (12: 28; 13: 31, 32). He prayed that He might be glorified that God might be glorified in Him (17: 1). Often He spake of *My time, My hour*, indicating that the whole course of His life was ordered by the Father. "I must work," He said (9: 4), I as other men, obedient to the divine will. He even declared that the Father, who loved Him before the foundation of the world, loved Him because He became obedient unto death. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again" (10: 17. Comp. Phil. 2: 8, 9). His life was hallowed by prayer. Three prayers of Jesus are recorded in the Gospel. (*a*) At the grave of Lazarus. "Father, I thank thee that thou hearest me. And I know that thou hearest me always; but because of the multitude which standeth around I said it, that they may believe that thou didst send me" (11: 41). The words point to a prayer previously offered. (*b*) The request of the Greeks to see Him brought vividly to His mind the thought of His approaching death, and He exclaimed, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour," from the suffering that lies just before me. Of Him, too, it may reverently be said, the spirit was willing, but the flesh was weak. There was no more sin in that recoil from pain and suffering and anguish of soul than in the quiver of the nerves when the

nails tore through the tender flesh. But how soon and how nobly the spirit conquered. "For this cause"—to endure this suffering—"came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name," whatever may befall me. This is the spirit that breathes in the prayer of Gethsemane, "not my will, but thine, be done." Strong emotion speaks in these broken words (12: 27, 28). (c) The high priestly prayer in chapter seventeen, which will be considered hereafter. It is also noted that He gave thanks in breaking the bread for the multitude (6: 11), though the words that He used are not preserved. We find in His prayers adoration, thanksgiving, petition, submission ; but never confession.

Specifically, He came as the bread of heaven, that a man may eat and not die (6: 50); that men may have life, and may have it more abundantly (10: 10); to give light to the world (8: 12; 12: 46); to bear witness to the truth (18: 37); not to judge the world, but to save the world (3: 17; 12: 47). Yet judgment though not the purpose is the inevitable result of His mission in the case of those who do not believe (8: 15, 16; 9: 39). If the salvation which He proffers were accepted by all, there would be no room for judgment. "I judge no man. Yea, and if I judge"—if judgment be forced upon me by the unbelief of men—"my judgment is true" (8: 16).

Whether the Word would have become incar-

nate if man had not sinned, is a question to which the Scripture returns no direct and explicit answer. Among recent writers the affirmative is maintained by Westcott, *Epistles of John*, p. 273, Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 131, Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 302, and Ottley, Art. *Incarnation*, Hastings' B. D., p. 465. On the other side see Kuyper, *Holy Spirit*, p. 242, Calvin, *Instt.*, Bk. II, chap. 12, and Thos. Aquinas, 3: 1: 3. Here it must suffice to say that His coming is uniformly associated in Scripture with the purpose of redemption. The New Testament treats of the relation of God not so much to man *the creature* as to man *the sinner*. If other purposes are involved in the incarnation, they are so overshadowed by the purpose of redemption that no distinct trace of them can be found in the New Testament; and the question belongs rather to the realm of speculation than of exposition.

Gathering these varied representations in a single phrase, we learn that He came to redeem man by revealing God, for to know God is life eternal.

He reveals God in various ways.

(A) Supremely in His Person. He was in the Father, and the Father in Him (14: 10-12). In point of character there is nothing in Him which is not in God; there is nothing in God which is not in Him. The fulness of the Godhead dwells

## 116 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

in Him in bodily form. He manifested to His disciples the name of the Father (17: 6), and in that name, that divine revelation of the grace and truth of God which was given Him for them, He prayed that they might be kept (17: 11, 12). To see Him is to see the Father (14: 9; 12: 45); to know Him is to know the Father (8: 19; 16: 3); to believe in Him is to believe in God (12: 44); to hate Him is to hate God (15: 23, 24); to glorify Him is to glorify God (11: 4; 13: 31, 32); He is to be honored as the Father (5: 23), and trusted as the Father (14: 1). He accepted from men the loftiest titles—the Son of God, the King of Israel (1: 49; 12: 13, 15); the Holy One of God (6: 69); the Christ, the Son of God (11: 27); Master and Lord (13: 13; 15: 15, 20); my Lord and my God (20: 28). There was no title so lofty, no honor so exalted, no devotion so absolute, that He rejected it at the hands of men. The utmost that they could give He received as His due, and suffered them to render to Him all that God requires.

In His human nature He enjoyed that direct communion with God which belonged to unfallen man. Angels appear only once in the Gospel, at the sepulchre (20: 12); and are alluded to once by Jesus—"Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man" (1: 51); and once by the people, when a voice came from heaven, and

some said that it thundered, while others said "An angel hath spoken to him" (12:29). The reference to the troubling of the water by the angel in 5:4 must of course be rejected. In Matthew and Luke the angels play a considerable part; in John Jesus is represented as in such close communion with the Father on the one hand and with the disciples on the other that there is little room for the intermediate ministry of angels. But we must not disregard the clear intimation of angelic ministry in 1:51. Jesus said to Nathanael, Do you wonder that I read your heart, that I knew the workings of your soul under the fig-tree? You shall see something greater, the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man. The words express the constant and unbroken intercourse of Jesus with heaven. But the specific reference to the angels is not satisfied by a purely symbolic interpretation. In this intercourse the angels are represented as bearing a part. And their relation to Jesus is twofold. As He is man, they are ministering spirits (Heb. 1:14), and wait upon Him in His hour of need, in the wilderness (Matt. 4:11), and in the garden (Luke 22:43). As He is the Son of God, they are His servants, obedient to His will. This the disciples recognized, and in this the promise was fulfilled.

God is holy is the message of the Old Testament, God is love is the message of the New.

## 118 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

Holiness and love find their supreme exhibition in Jesus Christ. The Jews and the Romans honored virtue, and created the Pharisee and the Stoic; the Greeks worshipped love, and perverted it to animal passion. Perfect holiness and perfect love are united in Christ alone—holiness without pride, love without sin. In Him the holiness of God was tested by temptation, the love of God was measured by sacrifice. The divine holiness appears in Him not exalted above reach of temptation, but treading the ways of earthly life, amid suffering and sin, tempted in all points, yet remaining pure as the light. Creation cost God a word, providence a decree; redemption cost Him the blood of His own Son.

Light is thrown upon His Person by the titles Son of man and Son of God.

*Son of man.*<sup>1</sup> The title is more frequent in the earlier Gospels than in John. Matthew records it thirty times, Mark fourteen, Luke twenty-five, John twelve. (See list in Hastings' B. D.; Vol. 4, p. 579, art. *Son of man*. The whole article is worthy of careful study.) As a title of humiliation it was felt to be appropriate to His lips alone, and is given Him only by Stephen (Acts 7:56). "Jesus . . . is not the Son of man, but the Son of God" (Ep. of Barnabas 12). It is a Messianic title, drawn from Daniel 7:13ff., a passage which Jesus distinctly applied to Him-

<sup>1</sup> See Dalman's *Words of Jesus*; pp. 234-267.

self in Matthew 24:30 and 26:64. There the four kingdoms are contrasted with the kingdom that shall destroy them in three respects. (a) In origin. They are from the sea, the figure of the world; this is from heaven. (b) In character. They are bestial; this is human, humane. The Godlike in man triumphs over the beast. (c) In duration. They are transient, this is eternal. As in the case of *the servant of Jehovah* of Isaiah, it is debated whether Daniel's phrase, "one like unto a son of man," designates the Messianic people or the Messianic King. Both views are represented in Hastings' B.D., Articles *Daniel* and *Messiah*. For our purpose the difference is not important. As the promise relating to the seed of the woman (Gen. 3:15) is fulfilled to mankind through Christ, so the prophecies concerning Israel are fulfilled through Israel's King. Jesus applied the prediction to Himself, and asserted that not only in form but in fact He was man. Every promise and prophecy of good is accomplished in Him.

Early in the history of the church this truth was assailed. There were those who denied Him a human body, there were those who denied Him a human soul. The denial of His true humanity was one of the characteristic errors of gnosticism. That this subtle form of heresy took its rise in apostolic times is evident from the Epistle to the Colossians, 1 and

2 Timothy, 1 John, and the Apocalypse. Assuming as a fundamental principle that matter is intrinsically evil, and that God can have no contact with it, the gnostics were forced to repudiate either the divinity or the humanity of Christ. If He be God He cannot take to Himself a material body. Thus gnosticism broke away from historical Christianity, rejected the witness of evangelists and apostles, and swept away the foundation of faith, yet sought to keep the truth while denying the fact, to retain the Christ of faith while rejecting the Christ of history. To deny that He is man is to thrust God back into the darkness from which He came forth to save us. It is to follow the example of the savages who were so delighted with the gift of a sundial that in token of reverence they built a roof over it and shut out the sun. Moreover to deny the dual nature of Christ is to set aside His atoning work. The Redeemer is the God man. His humanity made His suffering possible; His divinity gave infinite value to His suffering. The immortal assumed mortality that He might die. The price of redemption is the blood of the Son of God. Against this widespread and dangerous error John contended in his Epistles, and over against it stands the title *Son of man*. His humanity is attested on every page. He had a true body and a reasonable soul. He experienced the physical conditions

of weariness, hunger, thirst, suffering, death; and all the sinless emotions that operate in the soul of man, trouble, peace, joy, love, sympathy, sorrow.

Observe the singular reading *λύει* for *μὴ δμολογεῖται* in 1 John 4: 3—"Every spirit which confesseth not (annulleth) Jesus is not of God." So Westcott and Hort in margin; margin of the Revised Version, *annulleth*; Vulgate, *solvit*. Socrates says that it was found in the ancient copies, and adds: "The mutilation of this passage is attributable to those who desired to separate the divine nature from the human economy, or, to use the very language of the early interpreters, some persons have corrupted this epistle, aiming at separating the manhood of Christ from His deity. But the humanity is united to the divinity in the Savior, so as to constitute, not two persons, but one only" (*Hist. Eccles.* 7: 32). This reading is attested also by Irenæus (*Hær.* 3: 16, 8), by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 5: 16), by Augustine (in loc.), and by Cassian (*Seven Books on the Incarnation*, 5: 10). Lightfoot (*Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 118, note), Farrar *Early Days of Christianity*, in loc.), and Haupt, in loc., incline to accept it. It is probably an ancient gloss, and indicates the sense in which the early Church understood the words of the apostle.

The title thus asserts in unmistakable terms the *reality* of His manhood. Whatever else He

might be, whatever more He might be, He was man. But further it suggests the *quality* of His manhood. The name belongs in general to all men, as it is used for example in Ps. 8: 4, and throughout the prophecy of Ezekiel. In appropriating to Himself this common name, Jesus declares that He is what the name denotes in supreme degree. In Him humanity is raised to the highest power. The title at once identifies Him with men, and distinguishes Him not *from* but *among* men.

The peculiarity of His Person is twofold.

I. He is the *Perfect* man. He alone fulfils the divine purpose in man's creation, is what God made man and meant man to be. We are only sketches or suggestions of manhood. His character was like His robe, woven without seam. Therefore though He has the briefest of biographies He is the best known of men. Every word and act was a disclosure of His unchanging nature. It belongs to the perfection of the circle that if the smallest arc be given the whole circumference may be described.

He claimed to be without sin. "I do always the things that are pleasing to him" (8: 29). "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" (8: 46). "The prince of the world cometh; and he hath nothing in me" (14: 30). The world shall be compelled to recognize His righteousness (16: 10). He never betrayed the slightest consciousness of

sin ; prayed often, but never prayed for pardon. He distinguished Himself in this regard from the world—"I am not of the world" (17: 14, 16), and from the Jews—"Ye are from beneath; I am from above" (8: 23, 35, 38). "Ye must be born again," He said to Nicodemus. Death was to Him not the wages of His own sin, but a voluntary sacrifice for the sake of men. He died for the sins of others. "For their sakes I sanctify myself" (17: 19). This claim is the more remarkable because (1) He was a Jew, trained in the Old Testament, of which the cardinal doctrines are the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man. Compare Peter's words at Cæsarea, "I myself also am a man" (Acts 10: 26), and Paul's at Lystra, "We also are men of like passions with you" (Acts 14: 15). There spoke the pious Jew. (2) He was keenly conscious of the prevalence and power of sin, and quick to detect it in other men. (3) He had the profoundest apprehension of the spirituality of the law ; and in His teaching dealt always with the inner life of men, motive, disposition, character. (4) Self-righteousness was to Him of all sins the most abhorrent and the most sternly condemned (9: 41). (5) He professed the closest intimacy with God, and in general as men draw near to Him they are overcome with the sense of their unworthiness (Job 42: 5, 6; Ps. 51; 130: 3; Is. 6: 5; 64: 6; Dan. 9; Luke 5: 8; 1 John 1: 8, 10;

## 124 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

1 Tim. 1:15). The holier they become, the more sensible are they of sin.

He was not only free from sin, but wholly consecrated to God. Beneath the shadow of the cross, as He passed His life in review, He said, "I have kept my Father's commandments" (15:10). "I have glorified thee on the earth, having finished the work thou didst give me to do" (17:4). In face of death He could discover no failure in duty, no stain upon His life.

2. He is the *Representative* man. He is the seed of the woman, the last Adam, the seed of Abraham. As man fell in Adam, man is redeemed in Him. He assumed to act on behalf of the race. The Son of man is everybody's brother. The interests of humanity are entrusted to Him, the fortunes of mankind are bound up with His person. The character of men is betrayed and shaped and their destiny determined by their relation to Him. If they are disposed to truth and righteousness, they will welcome Him in whom truth and righteousness are embodied. If they know God, they will recognize God in Him. And the attitude of God towards men is determined therefore by their attitude towards His Son. "If any man serve me, him will the Father honor" (12:26). "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father" (14:21). He gives His life for the world. As He represents God to man, so He represents man to God.

*Son of man* is therefore a term at once of character and of relation. Of itself it conveys simply the thought of a perfect and representative manhood. Whether it involves a higher claim must be determined by the predicates attached to it by Jesus, and by the Old Testament conception of the Messiah. What those predicates were will appear in the course of the exposition. It can hardly be questioned that in the thought of Jesus the Messiah of the Old Testament is divine. The question, "If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" (Matt. 22: 45) can have no other answer. Then the use of a Messianic title carries with it the claim of divinity.

One question remains. Jesus carefully avoided the name Messiah, except in extraordinary cases, lest He should foster the carnal hopes of the Jews, and excite political disturbance. Why then did He wear so conspicuously a Messianic title? In answer it must be observed that *Son of man* was not a current designation of the Messiah, nor did the Jews commonly regard the Messiah as divine. There lay in the title a claim which those only could understand who apprehended the teaching of the Old Testament. The significance of the term broke gradually upon the Jews, and upon the disciples; and it was through the teaching of Jesus Himself that it came to be generally recognized as Messianic. It was therefore admirably adapted to His pur-

## 126 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

pose, for like the parable it at once veiled and revealed the truth, as men were prepared to receive it. In the beginning of His ministry He presented Himself to the people as their Messiah in the cleansing of the temple, but the significance of the act was not understood. Towards the close of His life the force of the term had grown clear. The people asked, The Christ of whom we read in the law abideth forever ; who is this Son of man, whom you identify with the Christ, yet declare shall be put to death? (12: 34); and His judges understood that He claimed to be the Son of man, the Son of God, and the Christ (Luke 22: 67-70).

*Son of God.*<sup>1</sup> This term Jesus nowhere applies to Himself directly in the earlier Gospels, though in several instances (Matt. 11: 27; 28: 19; Mark 13: 32; Luke 10: 22) He termed Himself *the Son*; and accepted the title *Son of God* from the high priest (Matt. 26: 63; Mark 14: 61; Luke 22: 70). As He hung upon the cross, the chief priests mocked Him, saying, He said, I am the Son of God. In the Gospel of John He appropriates the title five times ; and calls Himself *His* or *Thy Son* four times, and *the Son* fifteen times. The Jews arraigned Him before Pilate on the charge that He made Himself the Son of God (19: 7).

This too was a Messianic title, based upon Ps.

<sup>1</sup>See Dalman's *Words of Jesus*, pp. 268-289.

2: 7—"Thou art my son," and 2 Sam. 7: 14—"I will be his father, and he shall be my son." And because it seems to bear a more obviously Messianic sense than Son of man, it is far less frequently used.

In the earlier Gospels God is termed with almost equal frequency the Father of Jesus and of men. But in John the term is almost always applied to His relation to Jesus. The only exceptions are 4: 21–24, where He speaks to the woman of Samaria of the Father; and 20: 17, "My Father and your Father." He is the *only begotten* Son. John gives the title *υἱὸς θεοῦ* to Christ alone, men are *τέκνα*; while Paul uses both terms of men. *τέκνον* presents the relation on the side of growth and birth, *υἱός* on the side of dignity and privilege. He through whom the sonship of men is mediated must be more than man.

Evidently the impression was made alike upon friends and foes that He claimed the title in a peculiar sense. Twice during His ministry the Jews brought against Him the charge that He called Himself the Son of God, and it is instructive to observe how He met it upon each occasion.

(a) 5: 18ff. When He was accused of breaking the Sabbath by healing the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, He pleaded in justification of His conduct the example of the

Father. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." The work of creation is completed, but the work of providence and redemption never ends. The Sabbath was ordained for the very purpose of accomplishing that work. To minister to the needs of men is not to transgress but to fulfil the law of the Sabbath. His answer the Jews regarded as equivalent to a claim of divinity. "He called God his own Father, making himself equal with God." He declared that His activity was coextensive with that of the Father—"whatsoever things he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner"—reaching even to the resurrection and the judgment. The question is debated whether in the following discourse He is speaking of the eternal relation of the Son to the Father, or of His estate of humiliation. But the whole passage has regard to the Son in His historical mission among men. It is Himself as He is known to them of whom the Jews inquire, of whom He speaks; though indeed in the background of His thought lay always the eternal subordination inherent in the Godhead. He claims the place of the Son, representing the person and exercising the authority of the Father in obedience to the Father's will.

(b) At the feast of dedication the Jews asked Him, "How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly" (10: 24). He answered, "I and the Father are one." It is

plain that unity of will and power is meant. But this, the Jews conceived, must rest upon unity of nature; and they charged Him with blasphemy in making Himself God. His answer vindicates His right to the title Son of God, which is involved in His use of *My Father*. The Old Testament called the rulers of the people gods (Ps. 82 : 6), because they received their authority from God, and acted as His representatives among men. If they may bear that name, why may not He call Himself the Son of God? They were corrupt judges; Him the Father hath sanctified: they were mortal men, born of earth; Him the Father hath sent into the world. This is not merely an argument ad hominem, nor does Jesus put Himself on the same level with other sons of God, and repudiate all higher claims. That would be to contradict Himself. The argument is this. The Old Testament points to such a relation between God and man that men in official station as God's ministers may bear His name. That relation culminates in Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world. Therefore He has a special right to the title. His answer of itself therefore neither affirmed nor denied His divinity. It simply met the issue of the hour by asserting His right to the title Son of God, as in the highest sense the representative of God on earth. If earthly rulers may be termed gods, surely He who came

down from heaven may wear the title Son of God.

(B) In His teaching.

Several characteristics of it should be noted.

(a) It is personal. The earlier Gospels comprise the witness of men to Jesus; this Gospel comprises the witness of Jesus to Himself. Other teachers seek to hide themselves behind the truth; He and the truth are one. The Word of God came by the prophets, and they revealed His will in part; Jesus is the Word, and in Him the revelation is complete. The prophet is only the hand that bears the torch; He is the light. All the lines of His teaching converge upon Himself, for He is the image, the visible manifestation, of the invisible God. Of every discourse He is the theme. His doctrine centres in His person. All truths meet in Him who is the Truth. He does for men all that the truth can do. "The truth shall make you free"; "the Son shall make you free." "The Spirit shall guide you into all the truth"; "he shall testify of me." In the earlier Gospels the theme of His discourse is the kingdom of heaven, of God; here it is Himself. "The kingdom of heaven is like"—"I am." His teaching assumes an intensely personal form. Jesus uses the personal pronouns in relation to Himself one hundred and fifty-five times in Matthew, seventy-four times in Mark, one hundred and thirteen times in Luke, and

four hundred and ninety-nine times in John; while the reflexive pronoun, occurring sixteen times, is found in John alone.

He affirmed that He was all that is necessary to life, the full development and unfettered exercise of all man's powers. Moses asked, What is thy name? (Ex. 3: 13). And God said, I am—with what eagerness Moses listened: God was about to disclose Himself, to give Himself a name. But the answer returned upon itself, and denied what it seemed about to reveal. "I am that I am." God cannot define Himself, no word can contain Him for whom the heavens are too small. Throughout the old dispensation God labored to express Himself, gave men such fragments of truth as could be conveyed in rite and type and symbol and speech and sacrifice. Jesus takes up and completes the sentence that Jehovah left unfinished. I am, said God to Moses, that I am. I am, said Jesus, the door, the good shepherd, the light, the vine, the bread of life. These are the things with which men are most familiar. They play a part in the humblest life, they minister to daily need. I am that I am is majestic, sublime. But it is the majesty of the mountain top, remote, inaccessible, untrodden by the foot of man. I am the bread, the door, the light, the way, these are the streams that flow down the mountainside and water the valleys beneath.

(b) It is comprehensive. He claimed all

truth as His province. "He that is of the truth heareth my voice" (18: 37). In the realm of thought truth is reality; in the realm of character truth is righteousness. In both He is King. It is the aim of every true teacher to tear away the veil of tradition or prejudice that blinds the eyes of men, that they may see things as they are. Socrates taught men to look out upon the world and in upon themselves with open vision. Bacon found men given to idolatry. The idols or fancies of the human mind are contrasted with the ideas of the divine; and they fall into four classes. There are idols of the tribe, which have their foundation in human nature; idols of the cave, which pertain to the individual man, for every man dwells in his own personality as in a cave: idols of the market-place, formed by the intercourse of men, in a word, conventionality; and idols of the theatre, the theories imposed by philosophic systems, which were so many stage plays, representing worlds of their own creation after an unreal and scenic fashion. The motto of the *Novum Organum* might be drawn from the Epistle of John—Keep yourselves from idols. When Bacon wrote, science had remained almost stationary for centuries. Men had not been studying the world that God made, but the world that Aristotle, Pythagoras, Ptolemy painted. Less than three hundred years ago when the Jesuit Scheiner informed his superior that he

had discovered spots on the sun, he was rebuked for his presumption. "I have read Aristotle from beginning to end, and find nothing about spots on the sun. Be convinced therefore, my son, that the spots are in thy glasses or thine eyes, and not in the sun." Bacon led men out from the heated atmosphere and illusions of the play house, and bade them look upon God's world. In his own noble words, "Truth which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the inquiry of truth, which is the love-making or wooing of it; the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it; and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature. . . . Certainly it is heaven upon earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth" (Essay on Truth).

Jesus stripped off the falsehoods, the prejudices, the fancies, the conventionalities with which men had concealed the truth. The Rabbis had spun their cobwebs over the sacred page, He brushed them away. Leave your traditions, He said, and turn to the Word of God. Look out upon His world, and see what He does; open your hearts to His Spirit, and know what He is. Whenever He spoke to men, He set them face to face with fact, reality, truth. But it is not enough to know. Truth must grow from knowledge to action, to character. Reality must turn

to righteousness, for righteousness is the soul's accord with reality. Jesus alone has original knowledge of God, who is truth, the ground of all being, and the source and standard of all righteousness. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (1:18). "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is from God, he hath seen the Father" (6:46). He spoke of things earthly, lying within the range of human experience, and of things heavenly, not yet revealed (3:12). He knew what was in man (2:24, 25). How well He read the heart is illustrated in the case of Nathanael, of the woman of Samaria, of Judas, and of Peter. He foresaw the future, foretold His death, His resurrection, His return. The map of history was unrolled before Him, and He traced the unfoldings of the future to the end of time—the decay and destruction of the old economy, the mighty works to be wrought by His disciples, the overthrow of Satan, the triumph of the kingdom of God. Earth and heaven, time and eternity, God and man lay open to His view.

(c) Certainty. Traversing the whole range of moral and spiritual truth, He never betrays a moment's hesitation. There is never a note of indecision in His speech. "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen" (3:11).

This is the more remarkable because He usually taught not by formal discourse, but by conversation that grew out of the circumstances of the time. He answered the questions and met the needs of men as they arose. Yet He was never taken by surprise, was never at a loss. Every event yielded its lesson, every question met its apt response. He interpreted nature and providence and Scripture with equal facility and equal assurance. "He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes," because He drew from the fountainhead of wisdom. He often introduced His words with the formula, Verily, verily, I say unto you. John uses the word only in this doubled form, which is peculiar to his Gospel, and occurs twenty-five times. It is a term of strong asseveration, and emphasizes at once the certainty and the importance of the truth that follows.

There is found in this Gospel no such confession of ignorance as in Mark 13:32, "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Many attempts have been made to force upon the words another meaning, but in vain; they must be taken in their plain and obvious sense. Yet it should be observed that it was only the *time* of His coming that was hidden from Him. The precedents, concomitants, and consequences He foresaw and foretold. This single acknowl-

## 136 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

edgment of ignorance serves to confirm our faith in Him by assuring us that He taught only what He knew. His ignorance pertained to His human nature, and He recognized the limits of His knowledge because they were self-imposed. He is the only man that ever lived who could describe the boundaries of His knowledge with absolute precision. There was with Him no region of speculation or conjecture intermediate between certain knowledge and conscious ignorance, as in the case of all men besides. He did not suppose or infer. He knew or He did not know, and the line of division was to him precise and clear. Whenever He speaks, therefore, He speaks with authority.

(d) Life-giving and sanctifying power. "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life" (6: 63). "Thou hast the words of eternal life," said Peter (6: 68). "Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you" (15: 3). "I have given them thy word, . . . sanctify them in the truth; thy word is truth" (17: 14, 17). The power ascribed to the word of Jehovah in the Old Testament, as in Psalms 19 and 119, and Is. 55: 11, Jesus claims for His own teaching, because it is the word of God through Him. He distinguished Himself from the prophets because He not merely conveys the truth, but is the

truth, and the truth exercises its power upon men only as they are brought into personal relation to Him. The Scripture gives life only by leading men to the living Word (5: 39, 40). Without Christ the Bible is literature, with Him it is life.

(C) In His works. The term works, *εργα*, in the Gospel signifies not His miracles alone, but the whole activity of His life. As we have already treated of His life in general, His miracles fall to be considered here. Miracles are not numerous in the Scripture. Ordinarily God fulfils His purpose through the operation of the natural laws and forces which He has ordained. But He is not bound by them. He is above the world as well as in the world, may work with tools or without them. Sometimes He makes bare His arm, and supersedes the common processes of nature. In this variety of method the divine wisdom is conspicuous. Faith in the uniformity of nature is essential to all our knowledge, to all our activity. Science and industry alike are built upon it. That the course of nature will pursue its accustomed round, that the sun will tread his daily path through the heavens, that the seasons will come and go with interchange of seed-time and harvest, that the properties of matter and spirit abide evermore unchanged, upon this assumption all our hopes and purposes repose. Else to-morrow might usher us into a

new world, where all our past experience would be confounded. If miracles were so frequent as to shatter or disturb our faith in the constancy of nature, they would tear away the ground on which we stand, rob us of the principles by which life is governed, destroy the motives of industry, and lead us from the realm of law to the realm of chance. But if that uniformity were never broken, we might conclude that there is no power in the universe higher than the forces to which we have grown accustomed. If there were many miracles, we might lose faith in nature; if there were no miracles, we might lose faith in God. There are miracles, but they are few, that we may believe alike in nature and in God. They are not numerous enough to disturb our faith in nature, they are numerous enough to confirm our faith in God.

Beside the crowning miracle of the resurrection, common to all the Gospels, Matthew records twenty miracles, Mark eighteen, Luke twenty-one, and John eight. These, however, are only instances and examples chosen from a much larger number. There is frequent reference to miracles of which no record is preserved (2: 23; 3: 2; 6: 2, 26; 7: 31; 12: 37; 20: 30). A large proportion of those recorded are contained in two or more of the Gospels, so that there are in all only thirty-five which are specifically reported.

The miracles related by John are :

- (1) The turning of the water into wine (2).
- (2) The healing of the nobleman's son (4: 46ff.).
- (3) The cure of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda (5).
- (4) The feeding of the five thousand (6).
- (5) Walking on the sea (6: 19).
- (6) The healing of the blind man (9).
- (7) The raising of Lazarus (11).
- (8) The draught of fishes (21).

Of these all but four and five are peculiar to John. The Gospel apparently never records a miracle for its own sake, as an exhibition of divine power, but only as a hinge on which the narrative turns, or as the occasion of a discourse. (1) was the first miracle, which confirmed the faith of His disciples, and foreshadowed the character of His ministry; (2) marked the beginning of His Galilean ministry, after He had roused the hostility of the Pharisees in Judea; (3), (4), (5) and (6) furnished the introduction to teaching of the highest importance; (7) was the immediate occasion of the outbreak of Jewish hatred which issued in His death; (8) led to the closing conversation with His disciples, with its reference to the fortunes of Peter and John. Evidently miracles hold a subordinate place in the Gospel, and their evidence is recognized as of an inferior kind. They serve rather to con-

firm than to awaken faith. Stress is laid upon the self-evidencing power of the truth, its adaptation to the nature and the needs of men. The works of which He affirms that they bear greater witness than that of John (5: 36; 10: 25), the works that His disciples shall surpass (14: 12), are not His miracles solely or chiefly, but His whole Messianic activity. Miracles are on the one side the natural expression of His pity and His love towards men, and on the other side a witness to His divine authority. They were signs, pointing to spiritual truth. To the multitude He said, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs"—recognized the spiritual import of the miracle—"but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled" (6: 26). Miracles have therefore an evidential value, as was seen by Nicodemus (3: 2), the blind man (9: 33), and some of the Jews (10: 21; 11: 45). But faith born of miracles is distinctly depreciated. "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe" (4: 48). "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (20: 29).

The atonement will be treated in chapter eight.

It is evident from this review that the divinity of Jesus may be demonstrated by three main lines of argument, each of which has been presented or will be presented in its proper place.  
(a) His relation to God the Father, as possessing

the same attributes and authority ; (b) His relation to the Holy Spirit, as the theme of His witness bearing and the sphere of His activity ; (c) His relation to men, as being to them all that God can be, and doing for them all that God can do. His earthly ministry is significant because it represents not an exceptional moment in the life of God, but His eternal and unchangeable nature. What God was in Christ, He is forever. What He wrought in Him, He is forever working in the hearts and lives of men. Jesus is God manifest in the flesh.

## V

### THE WORD—HIS HEAVENLY MINISTRY

THE life and the work of Jesus on earth were finished together. "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do" (17: 4). "It is finished" (19: 30). By His death He made atonement for the sins of men. But the purpose of His coming was not yet fulfilled. As the work of providence follows upon creation, so the work of salvation follows upon atonement. The sacrifice was offered by God, it must be accepted by man. The salvation provided must be appropriated. It is of no avail to procure salvation unless men be persuaded and enabled to embrace it. After death therefore He entered upon a new stage of His ministry, the *application* of the salvation which He purchased with His blood. His earthly life furnished the sacrifice for the world, through His heavenly ministry the benefits of that sacrifice are applied to individual men. "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world" (6: 51). The sacrifice offered for all must be appropriated by each. Once for all He died for men, He saves them one by one. His heavenly ministry secures to men the bene-

fits of His earthly sacrifice, for as they could not furnish so they cannot of themselves appropriate it. His relation to His disciples and to the world therefore was not terminated by death. The forty days that intervened between the resurrection and the ascension form a period of transition from the earthly to the heavenly life. Of the ten appearances to His disciples recorded in the Gospels, John relates four—(a) to Mary Magdalene (20: 11); (b) to the ten in Jerusalem (20: 19); (c) to the eleven in Jerusalem (20: 26); (d) to seven disciples at the sea of Galilee (21). Of these (c) and (d) are found only in John. He appeared “not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead” (Acts 10: 41). Henceforth His bodily presence was withdrawn from the world, and He dealt with men through His Spirit and His disciples—“the Spirit and the bride.” Having laid off the body of the flesh, through which He exercised His ministry among the Jews, for His world-wide ministry He assumed a new body, a spiritual body, the church. In the body of His flesh He bore our sins upon the tree, through His spiritual body He makes known the glad tidings of this redemption to men.

Several purposes were served by His appearances to the disciples after His resurrection.

(a) He gave them His last instructions and

commands. He taught them truth and enjoined upon them duties which they were not prepared to receive or perform before. The theme of His teaching, as we learn from the earlier Gospels and the Acts, was the kingdom of God. They still conceived of that kingdom as the heritage of the Jew. "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1: 6). He had already taught that the kingdom should extend around the globe, but when or how this should be accomplished He had not told them. Now He intimates that the time is at hand, and that through *them* the gospel must be preached to the whole creation. He gave them the promise of power through the Spirit. That the Spirit should be sent He had already declared; now He told them the time and the place, in Jerusalem, "not many days hence." The promise and the command, vague and general hitherto, are renewed in direct and specific form; place and time and agent precisely indicated.

(b) He appeared to them upon different occasions and under different circumstances to convince them of the reality of His resurrection. They did not understand the prophecy of the resurrection, they could hardly believe the fact. When Mary Magdalene saw the empty tomb, she thought that His body had been removed. The disciples did not believe the women who said that they had seen Him, nor did Thomas believe the

disciples. When John saw the linen cloths lying, and the napkin that was about His head not lying with the linen cloths, but rolled up in a place by itself, this orderly arrangement forbade the supposition of hasty flight or removal, and he believed. He did not believe in the resurrection because of the Scripture, but in the Scripture because of the resurrection. He was not prepared to believe, and was convinced only by the evidence of his senses. The prophecy was dark until the fact made it plain. To all the disciples it might be said, as to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen thou hast believed;" though the difference of course remains that Thomas had the witness of his brethren, and yet would not believe.

(c) He appeared to them repeatedly and under varying conditions to assure them that He was the same Jesus whom they had known and loved. What change is wrought in men by death? Does it steal from them the memories and affections of earth? Does it sever the ties that bind them to one another? These are questions that had never yet been answered. What relation does the new world, the new life, bear to the old? Jesus showed His disciples that He was still the same, that He brought with Him from the grave all that He had borne thither, that He had forgotten nothing, lost nothing, by reason of those days of darkness. He resumed at once His re-

lations with them as their Master, their Friend, called them by name, ate with them, walked with them, talked with them as before. Death had robbed Him of nothing. "It is I myself" (Luke 24: 39).

Though essentially the same, in some respects He was altered, as they shall be who believe in Him. "We shall all be changed" (1 Cor. 15: 51). "He was manifested in another form" (Mark 16: 12). Mary Magdalene did not recognize Him until He called her by name (20: 14), though that may have been due in part to the fact that her heart was heavy with grief and her eyes were blinded with tears. He would not suffer her to cling to Him, because the touch was not needful to faith, as in the case of the disciples, and He would turn her thoughts to that spiritual relation which should prevail between them after He ascended to the Father. But beneath this superficial change, character and personality remained unaltered. His purpose is the same, though it enters upon a new era of development, and the ministry begun on earth in the flesh is continued in heaven through His Spirit animating His spiritual body, the church. The church, like the body of flesh that He wore, is the organ of His Spirit and the instrument of His will, and through it He labors and suffers and sacrifices. "I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake," said Paul, "and fill up on my part that which is lack-

ing of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church" (Col. 1: 24). The kingdom established by the sacrifice of the Son of God is extended by the sacrifice of His disciples, for He suffers again in them. "Why persecutest thou me?" (Acts 9: 4). God is one with His people. "He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye" (Zech. 2: 8). "In all their affliction he was afflicted" (Is. 63: 9). This is brought out by Augustine in a striking passage of his Homilies on 1 John 10: 8.

No account is given in John of the ascension. We owe the record of it indeed entirely to Luke, for the closing verses of Mark must be regarded as a later addition.

Thus Jesus brought with Him from the grave His human nature, and with it returned to the Father. In heaven He appeared to John like unto a Son of man (Rev. 1: 13), and as the Lamb that was slain (5: 6), and Stephen saw the Son of man standing on the right hand of God (Acts 7: 56). The nature that He assumed in the incarnation is His forever. The heavenly priest is He who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin (Heb. 4: 15). A brother's heart beats in the breast of the Son of God.

As His ministry towards the world is exercised through His Spirit and His church, it will be treated in chapters six, nine and ten. Much re-

mained to be done for His disciples after His ascension. They were yet in the world, exposed to tribulation and temptation, in need of instruction, of sanctification, of power. His relation to them was not bounded by earth or time, and the ministry on their behalf begun on earth is continued in heaven.

Various offices are ascribed to Him on behalf of His people in His estate of exaltation.

(a) He intercedes for them. He prayed for them on earth, He prays for them in heaven. He promised His disciples, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth" (14: 16). For this alone He promised to pray, for in the gift of the Spirit is comprehended all spiritual blessing. In the prayer that He offered for His disciples the night He was betrayed, He asked that they might be kept from the evil one, that they might be sanctified in the truth, that they and all believers may be one, that they might be with Him and behold His glory. These petitions are all answered in the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit prays within us, translating our desires into the speech of heaven (Rom. 8: 26, 27), and Christ prays for us with continual intercession (Rom. 8: 34). Him God hears always (11: 42).

To the time following the gift of the Spirit must be referred the words of 16: 26—"In that

day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you; for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came forth from the Father." I will pray for the Spirit, but after He is come, and in so far as you shall be in fellowship with the Father through Him, you shall have no need that I pray for you. But as in the case of every man fellowship with the Father through the Spirit is hindered by sin, there is yet constant need of the intercession of the Son. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John 2:1). The Epistle to the Hebrews represents Him as the great High Priest, making continual intercession for them that draw near to God through Him (7:25). To this answers the form of expression here—not, I say that I will not, but I do not say that I will. (Compare 1 John 5:16—"There is a sin unto death: not concerning this do I say, that he should make request.")

(b) He answers prayer. "Whosoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask me<sup>1</sup> anything in my name, that will I do" (14:13,14). To Him men must pray, by Him their prayers shall be answered. Yet it was one of the first

<sup>1</sup> *Me* is doubtful, and the American revisers place it in the margin.

principles of the Old Testament that prayer should be addressed to God alone. Jesus assumes the attributes of deity. To hear the prayers of His people, He must be everywhere present, for He declared that the gospel should be preached in the whole world (Matt. 24:14; 26:13). To answer them He must be possessed of all power in heaven and on earth. To answer wisely He must be acquainted with all the circumstances and conditions of men, must be able to read the heart and to forecast the future. There can be no higher claim of divinity than the promise that He will hear and answer prayer. This office he ascribes to the Father, this He asserts for Himself. I will pray the Father for you, I Myself will answer your prayers. He does not hesitate to lay His hand upon the highest prerogatives of the Almighty, claims the authority, the power, the wisdom of God. He promises to be to men all that God can be, to do for them all that God can do; and associates Himself with the Father in the exercise of sovereign power and grace.

(c) He sends them the Holy Spirit. As the answer to prayer, so the gift of the Spirit is ascribed to the Father and to the Son. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go, I will send him unto you" (16:7). "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter" (14:16). "The Comforter,

even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name" (14:26). The first fruits of the Spirit He conferred upon them after His resurrection, when He breathed on them, and said unto them, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit" (20:22). On behalf of the disciples He prays God for the Spirit, on behalf of God He sends the Spirit to the disciples. How He binds God and man together. With the Father He answers prayer, with the Father He sends the Spirit. There is no attribute of deity which He does not claim to possess.

The Person and Office of the Spirit will be treated in the ensuing chapter.

(d) He prepares a place for them. "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (14:2, 3). By the Spirit He prepares the disciples for heaven, in heaven He prepares for them a place.

In the Old Testament God's house is the temple, and so it is ordinarily in the Gospels and the Acts. In the Epistles it is the church, always in the spiritual sense (1 Tim. 3:15; Heb. 3:2, 5, 6; 10:21; 1 Peter 4:17). Observe especially the contrast drawn between Moses, who was faithful in all his house, the Old Testament

church, and Christ the Son, "whose house are we" (Heb. 3:5, 6).

Sometimes the New Testament represents heaven as a city—"the Jerusalem that is above" (Gal. 4:26); "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. 12:22); "we seek after the city which is to come" (Heb. 13:14). The Holy City, the New Jerusalem, comes down out of heaven from God (Rev. 21). Usually it is a kingdom. Here only is it a house. When God is represented as a King, heaven is a city, a kingdom; when He is represented as a Father, heaven is a house, a home. Since it is His Father's house, Jesus claims it as His own. He purified the earthly house, He prepares the heavenly home. Under all changes of dispensation, Jewish, Christian, earthly, heavenly, "the Son abideth (in the house) forever" (8:35). There is one house, because there is one Father, one family. There are many mansions, because there are many children. Amid the multitude that no man can number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, individuality is not lost. Every man retains his own name—"I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life, and I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels" (Rev. 3:5); and shall have his own new name (Rev. 2:17). Throughout the Scripture change of

character and position is marked by change of name. So far from losing our personal identity in the world to come, we shall have it established and strengthened. Then for the first time we shall be truly ourselves. We were made in the image of God, and we are ourselves in the degree in which we are like Him. And as every man shall preserve there the name by which he was known on earth, and shall receive a new name in token of his new estate, so he shall have his own place. The kingdom was prepared for the righteous from the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:34); here the promise is that a place in the kingdom, the home, shall be prepared for every one. In the common home every child shall have his proper place.

Of the nature of that preparation nothing is told us; nothing, it may be, could be told. Yet there are hints of it in the Revelation, especially in the promises to the seven churches, and in the picture of the New Jerusalem (21, 22). There are given assurances of dignity and honor and blessedness beyond our power to conceive. All that is most precious and beautiful here below is made the figure of the bliss of heaven. Heaven is painted of necessity in colors drawn from the life of earth. Language is the outgrowth of experience, and there are no words to describe the future but those that are borrowed from the present and the past. Yet the highest here is the

lowest there. The crowns of earth are made of gold, and the streets of heaven. Joys unspeakable and full of glory, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, God has prepared for them that love Him. And He has revealed them unto us by His Spirit. They are spiritual joys, and the foretaste of them is granted to us here in so far as we are in fellowship with Him whose presence is heaven to the soul.

Shall we know each other in the life to come? The question is urgent, for it is pressed upon us by every new made grave. When we lay the dead to rest, we are forced to ask, Do we part forever? Or shall we meet again, and renew the fellowship so rudely broken by the hand of death? Scripture yields no explicit assurance, yet there are hints and suggestions sufficient to furnish at least that probability which Bishop Butler affirms to be the guide of life. It is hard to believe that God should implant in us affections, enjoin their exercise, give them the foremost place in shaping our characters and lives; and when they have entwined themselves about our friends, should tear us asunder forever. Memory is an element in retribution; Son, remember, said Abraham to the rich man of the parable (Luke 16: 25): shall it have no place in the bliss of heaven? Our Lord brought with Him from the grave the memories and affections of earth; and as we die with Him unto sin and

are buried with Him through baptism, we shall be raised with Him in the likeness of His resurrection. The promise is that we shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God. Shall we not know them, and if we know them, shall we know them alone? The spirits of the just made perfect are represented as a great cloud of witnesses watching our course. Do they see us and know us while they are in heaven and we on earth, and cease to know us when we are all together there? We may believe that we shall know each other in the life to come, and shall renew the friendships and affections of earth. If this be true, God prepares our home above by taking those we love to Himself. If He should ask, What can I do to make heaven home-like to you? what could we say but this, Home is where those I love are gathered? They make home here, they make home there. Heaven is no longer dim and distant, a land of shadows; it is real, it is near, it is home.

But above all else it is the presence of Jesus himself that makes heaven home to the believer. "I go to prepare a place for you," He said. His going is itself the preparation. To be with Him, to be like Him, is heaven. Then we shall see Him as He is, with no gross veil of flesh between.

In heaven as on earth the Word is the ultimate revelation of God. We dare not speak with assurance of mysteries so high, yet it appears in-

## 156 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

conceivable that God in His essential nature should be seen of men. He it is "whom no man hath seen nor can see" (1 Tim. 6: 16). The Infinite Spirit must manifest Himself in finite form that the creature may apprehend Him; and that manifestation is given in the Son. John was permitted to behold the heavenly glory, and throughout the Apocalypse the power, the majesty, the grace of God are exhibited in the person of the glorified Redeemer.

Because He returned to the Father, His disciples have knowledge perfected, prayer answered, joy fulfilled, the Spirit given, a place prepared. He is the author and finisher of faith, and having begun a good work will perfect it until the day when He shall come again to gather His people to Himself.

## VI

### THE HOLY SPIRIT

THE Word was the revelation of God from the beginning, the Spirit was at work from the beginning; but His personality, like that of the Word, is clearly disclosed only in the New Testament. In the Old Testament He is represented as active in the creation of the world (Gen. 1:2; Job 26:13; Is. 40:12); as fashioning and controlling the animals (Ps. 104; Is. 34:16), and man (Job 33:4; Gen. 6:3). He is everywhere present (Ps. 139:7). He qualifies men for service, giving skill to the artificer (Ex. 31:3; 35:31); strength and courage to the soldier (Judg. 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 Sam. 11:6; 1 Chron. 12:18); and wisdom to rulers, to Moses (Num. 11:17), to the elders (Num. 11:25, 26), to Joshua (Num. 27:18), and to David (1 Sam. 16:13). It is noteworthy that the Spirit is never said to have been given to Solomon, though he was the wisest of men. To the Spirit is ascribed the interpretation of dreams (Gen. 41:38), and prophecy (Num. 24:2; 1 Sam. 10:6, 10; Zech. 7:12). By Him the chosen people were led (Neh. 9:20; Is. 63:10, 11, 14; 30:1; Hag. 2:5; Micah 2:7; Zech. 4:6). By

## 158 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

Him the law of Moses was ordained (Heb. 9:8), and the Scripture given (Acts 1:16; 28:25; 1 Peter 1:11; 2 Peter 1:21; Heb. 3:7; 10:15). By Him men were instructed (Prov. 1:23), regenerated, and sanctified (Ps. 51:11, 12; 143:10; Ezek. 36:27; 37:14; 39:29). The prophets foretold that in the days of the Messiah the Spirit should be poured forth abundantly (Is. 32:15; 59:21; Joel 2:28, 29), fulfilling the desire of Moses that all the Lord's people were prophets (Num. 11:29); and that by Him the Messiah should be qualified for His ministry (Is. 11:1; 42:1; 61:1ff.). The gift of the Spirit is "the promise of the Father" (Acts 1:4), for in it is comprehended every blessing.

The doctrine of the Spirit is expounded with such clearness and fulness by our Lord in this Gospel, especially in chapters fourteen to sixteen, that unlike many portions of His teaching it has received no further development at the hands of the apostles. The Epistles add nothing to the representation of the Gospel.

We may consider the *Nature* and the *Office* of the Spirit.

1. *The Nature of the Spirit.*—(a) He is not an emanation, an attribute, an influence, a personification, but a Person. He is designated by the masculine pronouns, though *πνεῦμα* is neuter—*αὐτός* (16:7); *ἐαυτοῦ* (16:13); *ἐκεῖνος* (14:26; 15:26; 16:8, 13, 14). Personal acts and attri-

butes are ascribed to Him. He speaks (16: 13), teaches (14: 26), bears witness (15: 26), convicts (16: 8), regenerates (3: 5, 8). He is another Comforter, *ἄλλος*, not *επερός*, another of the same nature as Jesus, and comes to take His place. His free self-determining activity is declared in 3: 8—"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit"—that is, so is it in the case of every one that is born of the Spirit. The names given Him in the New Testament are those which denote personal qualities and activities. He is the Holy Spirit; Spirit of God, of your Father, of the Lord, of Jesus, of Christ; the Spirit of truth, of holiness, of life, of promise; the Eternal Spirit; the Lord, the truth.

(b) He is divine. We have already noted that the term *θεός* is rarely used of the Spirit. The desire to find explicit proof of the doctrine, to vindicate His deity by express declaration of the Word, has led to the corruption of the text of Scripture. Ambrose accepted a reading in John 3: 6 which has no manuscript authority and is obviously a gloss—"That which is born of the flesh is flesh, because it is born of the flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, because the Spirit is God." The final clause he accused the Arians of expunging (On

*the Spirit* 3: 59, 63). The church long clung to the famous passage of the three witnesses—“For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one” (1 John 5: 7), which even in our time has found defenders. These passages were not inserted with intent to deceive, but represent interpretations or explanations which were originally written in the margin and finally incorporated with the text.<sup>1</sup> The teaching of the Word is clear and ample, and needs no supplement or addition. If He is a Person, His divinity cannot be questioned, for the qualities and acts attributed to Him are those which belong to God alone. The very name indeed bears witness. God is Spirit, God is Holy. This name and this attribute are chosen to be the peculiar designation of the Third Person. He is the Holy Spirit. As the Word is the revelation of God, the Spirit is the breath or power of God; holy as the source of holiness in the creature. Augustine's account of the name is interesting if not satisfactory. “The Holy Spirit is a certain unutterable communion of the

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted by way of illustration that the Vulgate inserts a verse in Acts 23 to explain the care of the centurion for the safety of Paul in sending him to Cæsarea.—For he feared that the Jews might take him and kill him, and he himself be blamed for it, as if he had received a bribe (verse 25). See in general on the text of the Acts Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 23.

Father and the Son ; and on that account, perhaps, He is so called, because the same name is suitable to both the Father and the Son. For He Himself is called specially that which they are called in common ; because both the Father is a Spirit and the Son a Spirit, both the Father is holy and the Son is holy. In order therefore that the communion of both may be signified from a name which is suitable to both, the Holy Spirit is called the gift of both" (*On the Trinity* 5 : 11). Dr. Shedd remarks, "The reason which Augustine here assigns, why the name Holy Spirit is given to the Third Person—namely, because spirituality is a characteristic of both the Father and the Son, from both of whom He proceeds—is not that assigned in the more developed trinitarianism. The explanation in this latter is, that the Third Person is denominated the Spirit because of the peculiar manner in which the divine essence is *communicated* to Him—namely, by *spiration*, or outbreathing; *spiritus quia spiratus*. This is supported by the etymological signification of *πνεῦμα*, which is breath; and by the symbolical action of Christ in John 20 : 22, which suggests the eternal spiration, or outbreathing of the Third Person. The third trinitarian person is no more spiritual, in the sense of immaterial, than the first and second persons, and if the term 'Spirit' is to be taken in this the ordinary signification, the 'trinitarian

relation,' or personal peculiarity, as Augustine remarks, 'is not itself apparent in this name'; because it would mention nothing distinctive of the third person, and not belonging to the first and second. But taken technically to denote the spiration or outbreathing by the Father and Son, the trinitarian peculiarity is apparent in the name.

"And the epithet 'Holy' is similarly explained. The third person is the Holy Spirit, not because He is any more holy than the first and second, but because He is the *source* and *author* of holiness in all created spirits. This is eminently and officially His work. In this way also, the epithet 'Holy'—which in its ordinary use would specify nothing peculiar to the third person, mentions a characteristic that differentiates Him from the Father and the Son" (Note on Augustine in loc. Schaff's edition).

The question remains, however, whether the term "Spirit" does not designate rather an economical than a trinitarian relation; whether the Third Person is not so named as the manifested energy of God, rather than upon the ground of His eternal procession. As the Word is the eternal revelation, so the Spirit is the eternal energy, of the Father. He is the Holy Spirit, because He is the divine power whence all holiness proceeds. Both *Holy* and *Spirit* thus refer not to the inward relation but the outward manifestation of the Godhead. God is a Spirit,

the Holy Spirit is the Person of the Trinity through whom the spiritual power is exercised by which created spirits are rendered holy.

To the question whether there are more than two processions in the divine nature, Thomas Aquinas replies, "Since processions in the divine nature follow immanent actions, which in the intellectual and divine nature are only two, to understand and to will; there are only two processions in the divine nature, of the Word and of love" (1:27, 5). These are the generation of the Son and the spiration of the Spirit. The Son is wisdom, the Spirit is love.

(c) The same in essence with the Father and the Son, He is personally distinct. He is associated with them in the baptismal formula and the apostolic benediction. His relation to the Father is indicated in 15:26—"But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me." The construction indicates that the reference is not to the eternal procession but to the temporal mission of the Spirit. "I will send unto you *παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας* ὃ *παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται*. A similar phrase is used of the mission of the Son in 16:27—*ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον*, and in 17:8—*παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον*; and it denotes not proceeding *out of*, but from *the side or presence of*. The present

tense, *proceedeth*, points to the fact that the Spirit is always going forth from the Father, the perpetual executive of His will; the future, *I will send*, foretells a specific mission.

The precise relation of the Spirit to the Father is nowhere more closely defined. It differs from that of the Son, for the Spirit is never said to be begotten. Theologians have given it the name *procession*, which is not a Scriptural word, but may serve as a convenient term to designate an incomprehensible relation. "The Son is derived from the Father after the manner of generation, and the Holy Spirit likewise is derived from the Father, yet not after the manner of generation, but after that of procession. And we have learned that there is a difference between generation and procession, but the nature of that difference we in no wise understand" (John of Damascus, *Orthodox Faith* 8).

It is sometimes taught that the Spirit is only another name for the glorified Christ. There is indeed frequent interchange of office and title between the Spirit and the Son. The coming of the Spirit is the coming of Christ. Christ is the truth, the Spirit is the truth (1 John 5:7). "The Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3:17). The Son is one with the Father, the Spirit is one with the Son. That this oneness of nature, however, is accompanied by distinction of persons will appear as we proceed. It will be seen that the Spirit is

at once identified with the Son and distinguished from Him, as the Son is at once identified with and distinguished from the Father. If the Father and the Son are distinct, so are the Son and the Spirit.

Upon the question which has filled so large a place and played so conspicuous a part in the history of the church, whether the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, it may suffice to say, that procession is not a Scriptural term, and that the relation which it designates is inscrutable; that the Spirit holds the same relation to the Son as to the Father, so far as we are told, is termed the Spirit of the Father, the Spirit of the Son, is sent by the Father and the Son; and that we may presume upon the ground of this temporal relation that the eternal relation is the same. If the Spirit is related *economically* to the Son as to the Father, we may conclude that the trinitarian relation is not dissimilar. Yet in view of the personal subordination of the Son we are compelled to say with Augustine that the Spirit proceeds principally from the Father, as *fons Trinitatis* (*On the Trin.* 15 : 26, 47). So Thomas Aquinas teaches that the Spirit proceeds principally from the Father, because from the Father the power of spiration is imparted to the Son (1 : 36, 3).

The Gospel, the New Testament, throws no further light upon the question, which pertains

rather to the sphere of speculation than of interpretation. It is nowhere affirmed that the Spirit proceeds from the Son; neither is it anywhere affirmed that the Spirit proceeds from the Father. There is a form of derivation which is not generation, and we style it procession, the most general term that we can command.

2. *His Office.*—The recent volume of Dr. Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, contains much good material, but is verbose and exegetically weak. The literature of the subject is given in the introduction by Prof. B. B. Warfield.

Like the Son, the Spirit does not speak of Himself (14:10; 16:13). The Son came to reveal the Father, the Spirit comes to bear witness to the Son. It is the purpose of the Son to do the will of the Father, it is the office of the Spirit to fulfil the purpose of the Son. We may note several particulars.

(a) Through Him the incarnation was accomplished, the Word became flesh. Jesus was conceived of the Holy Spirit. Therefore was He sinless, though born of a sinful race. To Mary the angel said, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God" (Luke 1:35).

(b) By the Spirit Jesus was anointed at the opening of His ministry, and by the Spirit en-

dowed and led during His life on earth. The Spirit descended and abode upon Him (1:32). God "giveth not the Spirit by measure" (3:34), a general truth supremely illustrated in the Son. He gives as man is able to receive, for He is always seeking agents through whom He may execute His will. Jesus alone received the Spirit in full measure, because in Him alone was no hindrance of sin. The guidance of Jesus by the Spirit is less prominent in the Gospel of John than in the earlier Gospels, because His conduct is usually referred directly to the Father. It may be said indeed that the earlier Gospels portray the dependence of Jesus on the Spirit, and John portrays the dependence of the Spirit on Jesus. This results, of course, from the emphasis they lay respectively upon the human nature in Him and the divine.

(c) By the Spirit the work of Jesus is carried on and completed after His death. This is the main theme of the teaching regarding the Spirit in John. Jesus came in the name of the Father (5:43), the Spirit is sent in the name of the Son (14:26). The name of Jesus, as that which alone brings salvation, is the sphere in which the Spirit operates, and in which He is supreme, so that no man can call Jesus Lord but by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3). He has thus a double ministry to fulfil, to believers and to the world.

(a) To believers. His relation to them is expressed by the term *Paraclete*. Four times this name is given Him in the Gospel, and there alone —14: 16, 26; 15: 26; 16: 7. *Comforter* is not an adequate rendering, though it is employed in the Authorized and Revised Versions, for it has lost its original meaning of *strengthener*, and has come to signify simply *consoler*. The word means properly *advocate*, as it is used of Christ in 1 John 2: 1, and then *helper*, which is the sense it bears when applied to the Holy Spirit. He intercedes for us on earth indeed (Rom. 8: 26), as Jesus intercedes for us in heaven (1 John 2: 1); but His main office is not that of an advocate, one who pleads the cause of another, whether of men with God, or, as has been suggested, of Christ with men; but of a teacher and guide, as is evident from our Lord's teaching concerning Him in chapters fourteen to sixteen. (See Art. *Paraclete*, Hastings' B. D.) The word should be rendered therefore broadly *helper*, as in the second marginal reading of the Revised Version. Etymology must yield to the evident sense of the term as it is employed by Jesus. The Spirit is *another helper*, takes the place of Jesus with the disciples, continues His work on their behalf. As *advocate* is too narrow to express the relation of Jesus to His disciples, so is it too narrow to express the relation of the Spirit to them.

The work of the Son for the believer is followed by the work of the Spirit *in* the believer. As the Spirit of truth He guides believers into all the truth (16:13; 1 John 2:20). Through Him is the inward, through the Son is the outward revelation of the truth; as the love of God, manifested in the Son, is shed abroad in the heart by the Spirit (Rom. 5:5). Truth is of the Father, revealed by the Son, interpreted and applied by the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:10 ff.). All truth is of God, but it is of spiritual truth that Jesus speaks—"all things that pertain to life and godliness" (2 Peter 1:3). This instruction is a gradual process, not completed in this life. The promises of God are not bounded by the grave. Now we know in part, then shall we know even as also we are known (1 Cor. 13:12).

Therefore is the sin against the Holy Spirit without forgiveness, because it is the closing of the heart against the last appeal that God can make to man. Though He is Almighty, and worketh as He will, yet men may grieve, may even quench the Spirit (Eph. 4:30; 1 Thess. 5:19). After the gift of the Son and the work of the Spirit, what remains? What more can God give or do?

All the teaching of the Spirit has relation to the Son. "He shall bear witness of me" (15:26); "He shall not speak from himself;

but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak" (16:13). Jesus spake only what He heard from the Father—"As I hear, I judge" (5:30); "The things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world" (8:26); "For I spake not from myself; but the Father which sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (12:49; 14:10): the Spirit speaks only what He hears from the Father and the Son. False prophets (Jer. 23:16) and Satan (8:44), speak of their own; he only speaks truth who speaks what he has heard of God. Nothing is true which is not of Him.

With reference to the teaching of Jesus the Spirit fulfils a double function.

(1) He recalls and interprets what Jesus taught. "He shall bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you" (14:26). This is abundantly illustrated in the Acts. Words of Jesus which the disciples could not understand at the time became luminous in the light of the Spirit's teaching. To take a single instance, He foretold repeatedly His sacrificial death and His resurrection, yet they could not understand what He meant. "Peter took him and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall never be unto thee" (Matt. 16:22). But in the Acts this same disciple expounded the significance of the death and resurrection of

Jesus with such power that the multitude was profoundly moved, and three thousand were converted in one day. The revelation of the Son was followed by the illumination of the Spirit.

(2) He carries the teaching further, and speaks of that which Jesus left unspoken. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now"—can neither apprehend nor obey. "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all the truth" (16: 12, 13). The revelation begun by Jesus in the flesh is completed by Jesus through the Spirit. "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God" (1 John 4: 2, 3). The teacher is one, the truth is one. Nothing is true which is not in harmony with truth already taught. As the Truth, Jesus is the norm by which all professed revelations of the Spirit must be tried. The revelation within must accord with the revelation without; the teaching of the Spirit must lead to the incarnate Son. The Father speaks through the Son, the Son speaks through the Spirit. "The hour cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but shall tell you plainly of the Father" (16: 25). "To the law and to the testimony" (Is. 8: 20) is still the command. The Spirit in

the heart cannot contradict the Spirit in the Word ; each new revelation must be in harmony with the revelation already given. The witness of the Spirit to the individual must be in accord with the witness of the Spirit to the world. "He shall lead you into all the truth"; "thy word is truth." We must not test the Word by our feelings, but our feelings by the Word. Christian consciousness has its claims, but it is *Christian* only in so far as it is enlightened by the Spirit through the Word. Chrysostom says truly, "Many boast of the Holy Spirit; but in those who speak from themselves this is a false pretence. As Christ testified that He spake not of Himself, because He spake from the law and the prophets, so if under the name of the Spirit anything be obtruded that is not contained in the gospel, let us not believe it. For as Christ is the accomplishment of the law and the prophets so is the Spirit of the gospel" (cited by Calvin, *Instt.* iv. 8 : 13).

Included in the teaching of the Spirit is the unveiling of the future. "He shall declare unto you the things that are to come" (16: 13). Here too he speaks of Christ, who is the theme of prophecy alike in the Old Testament and in the New. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (Rev. 19: 10). "To him bear all the prophets witness" (Acts 10: 43). The teaching of the Spirit centres in Him who has

come in the flesh, who shall come again in glory. To make known the Christ who has come, who shall come, is His office ; and He speaks alike in history and in prophecy.

These promises were addressed immediately to the eleven, and how abundantly they were fulfilled is shown by the book of the Acts, which we may term the Gospel of the risen Christ, and by the Epistles and the Revelation. Through them the truth is given to us. Their revelation is ours, though not their inspiration. They too, like the old prophets, ministered not unto themselves, but unto us, which believe through their word (1 Peter 1: 12). The Spirit revealed the truth to them, the Spirit interprets the truth to us.

After Jesus left them, the Spirit was their sole and sufficient teacher. "In that day"—the day of my return in the Spirit—"ye shall ask me no question" (16: 23, margin of the Revised Version). John uses *ἐρωτᾶν* with almost equal frequency in the sense *to ask for*, and *to ask questions*. Here the use of the word in the latter sense in verse 19; the change to *αἰτεῖν* in the second clause of the verse; and the fact that *ἐρωτᾶν* is never used elsewhere in the Gospel of the prayers of the disciples, make this the better rendering. Through Him they are brought to God as their Father, and to the Spirit as their teacher ; so that He does not need to pray God for them (16: 26), nor do they need to ask Him

questions. The Spirit shall answer their questions, the Father shall answer their prayers.

The Spirit not only recalls and completes the teaching of Jesus, He applies to men the benefits of His atoning work. The redemption that Jesus has provided for the world is made effective for the individual through the power of the Spirit. Jesus gives men the right to become the sons of God, but the new birth by which they actually become the sons of God is of the Spirit. Jesus imparts life through the Spirit. This will be more fully treated in the chapter on Salvation. As men are sanctified by the word of Christ (15: 3), the truth (17: 17), and the Spirit applies the truth, sanctification is of Him. By Him believers are qualified for service. Jesus received the Spirit from the Father at the outset of His ministry; He bestowed Him upon the eleven at the outset of theirs (20: 22). Yet the full measure of His power was not given until Pentecost. The earlier gift was the first fruits of the later, as the later in turn is the first fruits of the heavenly inheritance. "Ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit . . . groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption" (Rom. 8: 23).

The Spirit dwells with the believer, within the believer (14: 16, 17). So essential is His work that "it is expedient for you that I go away," that I may send Him unto you (16: 7). The

work of Jesus in the flesh is completed by the work of Jesus in the Spirit. Great was the need of the Spirit on the part of the eleven. How imperfect was their knowledge—"We know not whither thou goest" (14: 5), "Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (14: 8); their faith—"Do ye now believe?" (16: 31); their love—"If ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced, because I go unto the Father" (14: 28); their capacity—"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now" (16: 12). In the few weeks that intervened between the crucifixion and Pentecost a marvellous transformation passed upon them. They became new men. We breathe a different atmosphere when we cross over from the Gospels to the Acts, we enter a new world. We ask, Is this John? Can this be Peter? The faint-hearted have become brave, the ignorant have grown wise. They were disciples, learners, and poor ones too; they became apostles, infallible teachers. When Jesus came down from the Mount of Transfiguration, He found nine of them helpless in the midst of a mocking crowd, unable to cast out a single evil spirit. After Pentecost miracles were wrought by them daily, and the shadow of Peter had power to heal. They grew to full stature in all the graces of Christian character. What largeness of view, what breadth of sympathy, what depth of insight, what stedfastness of faith, what

tenderness of love. They were Jews in the Gospel, they are Christians in the Acts. The descent of the Spirit quickened to vigorous life the germs of faith and love; as we have seen a tree, whose veins were long swelling with sap, in a single day under the warm spring sunshine with sudden burst of life array itself in robes of living green. A change was wrought in them instantly through the Spirit which the ministry of Jesus in the flesh had not effected in years. And the change that He wrought in them He works ultimately in all believers. Of Him alone the new life is begotten, by Him alone that life is nurtured and developed.

(b) To the world. God loved the world, Jesus died for the world; the work of the Spirit must have relation to the world. That relation is particularly described in 16: 8-11—"And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged." In general, as He comforts believers He convicts the world.

The word *convict*—*ἀλεγχεῖν*—signifies in the usage of the New Testament (*a*) to reprove, rebuke (Matt. 18: 15; Luke 3: 19; John 3: 20; 1 Tim. 5: 20; 2 Tim. 4: 2; Titus 1: 13; 2: 15;

Rev. 3: 19). The rebuke is always just, though not always effective, because the offender may harden himself against it. (*b*) to chasten (Heb. 12: 5). (*c*) to convict—*i. e.*, make the truth so plain that he is guilty who refuses belief. Many *accused* Jesus but none *convicted* Him of sin (John 8: 46; 1 Cor. 14: 24; Eph. 5: 11, 13; Titus 1: 9; Jas. 2: 9; Jude 15). These with the present passage are all the instances of the use of the word in the New Testament. *Convict* is outward, objective; *convince* is inward, subjective. He is convicted who is shown to be in error, he is convinced who owns himself in error. Convict is therefore the better rendering here. It points to the *nature*, while *convince* would point to the *effect* of the Spirit's witness. He so presents the truth to men that they *ought* to believe; whether they *do* believe the word does not indicate. We must not interpret the word therefore of condemnation only. Jesus came not to judge the world, but to save the world (12: 47); and the purpose of the Spirit's coming is the same. The end sought in conviction is conversion. The truth is made plain not that men may be condemned, but that they may be saved. The result of the Spirit's witness as of the ministry of Jesus is that some are converted and some are not.

The truth is pressed upon the world by the Spirit in three particulars.

(1) In respect of sin. He convicts the world of sin through its unbelief. Since Jesus is the clearest revelation of God, not to believe in Him evinces the utmost blindness and hardness of heart. It is not said that the world is convicted of the sin of unbelief, but of sin through unbelief. The unbelief is the crowning evidence of the sin. The world is shown to be sinful by the fact of unbelief, which discloses that spirit of alienation from God which is the source whence all sin proceeds. The sinfulness of the world is brought to light by the attitude of the world towards Jesus; the world's thought of God is exposed by its treatment of His Son. Does the world desire truth and righteousness and love? Let Calvary answer. Does the world love God? When He came to earth in the person of His Son, the world not only failed to recognize Him, but condemned and crucified Him as a malefactor. The Spirit makes plain to the world its sin by pressing upon it the fact of its unbelief.

(2) In respect of righteousness. The word is used in the broadest sense. The Spirit will declare the true nature of righteousness, and convict the world of error regarding it. This He accomplishes by manifesting the righteousness of Christ. Against the world's conception of righteousness the Spirit sets forth righteousness as it is found in Him. Crucified by the world as an evil-doer, He was declared righteous by His ex-

altation to the right hand of the Father (Acts 3: 13-15; Rom. 1: 4); and the power of His glorified estate was shown in the witness and work of His disciples. To the Jews He said, "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things" (8: 28). Upon His death and resurrection follows the manifestation of His righteousness in the outpouring of the Spirit and the ministry of the disciples.

(3) In respect of judgment. The world's standard of judgment is shown to be fatally in error. Jesus, condemned by the world, is exalted by God. Satan, the prince of the world, is condemned by God. The death of Jesus appeared to be the hour of Satan's triumph, yet in it he was condemned, his power broken (12: 31). Through death he destroyed him that hath the power of death, even the devil (Heb. 2: 14). This is made plain by the results of the ministry of the apostles. When the seventy returned with joy, saying, "Lord, even the demons are subject to us in thy name," Jesus answered, "I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven" (Luke 10: 18). In the casting out of evil spirits was foreshadowed the overthrow of their chief.

As the world lies in the wicked one (1 John 5: 19) it is judged in him, but not finally condemned. The world is *in sin*, between the right-

eousness of Christ and the judgment of Satan, and must take its place on this side or on that.

A divine standard then is given of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. In respect of each the world is convicted of error by a cardinal fact—in respect of sin, by the fact of unbelief; in respect of righteousness, by the exaltation of Christ; in respect of judgment, by the condemnation of Satan. Three great truths are made clear by the Spirit and pressed upon the hearts and consciences of men—the sin of the world, the righteousness of Christ, the judgment of Satan. The world is shown to be sinful by unbelief, Christ to be righteous by His exaltation, Satan to be condemned by the saving power of the gospel in the ministry of the disciples.

The witness of the Spirit is usually represented as borne through the disciples. His direct operation of course is not excluded, for He worketh when and where He will, and may speak directly to the heart. But ordinarily He bears witness through believers (17 : 20-23. Comp. Eph. 3 : 10). It is through them that the world is to be brought to knowledge and to faith. "But when the Comforter is come . . . he shall bear witness of me, and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning" (15 : 26, 27). "The apostolic testimony and the testimony of the Spirit unite, therefore, in one and the same act, but they do so while bringing

to it, each of them, a necessary element, the one, historical narration, the other, the inward evidence" (Godet in loc.)

Here it is distinctly this testimony of the Spirit which is meant. "I will send him unto *you*—and when he *comes*" (16:7, 8). He inspires, accompanies, and applies the word of the disciples. Ordinarily the Spirit in His saving and sanctifying energy operates upon the world through the church, because to the church is entrusted the Word in which Christ is made known. Thus to the might of God is added the power of human sympathy and experience.

In conclusion it should be remarked that the doctrine of the Spirit keeps pace with the revelation of the Word. Both are represented in the Old Testament rather as attributes or powers of God than as persons. Yet in the light of the New Testament foreshadowings of the Trinity are seen. A striking instance is found in Is. 48:16—"The Lord Jehovah hath sent me and his Spirit," if the speaker there is the Messiah. But the interpretation is obscure. The personality of the Word and the Spirit alike is first clearly brought to light in the New Testament. As it is the office of the Spirit to testify of Jesus and apply the benefits of His redemption, the Spirit was not given, that is, His power was not fully exercised, until Jesus' work on earth had been completed by His death (7:39). His personality was

## 182 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

not clearly disclosed until the incarnation nor His power fully manifested until the ascension of the Son. "The first creature of God, in the works of the days, was the light of the sense; the last was the light of reason; and His Sabbath work, ever since, is the illumination of His Spirit" (Bacon, *Essay on Truth*).

The coming of Christ in the Spirit is treated in the chapter on The End of All Things.

## VII

### THE DOCTRINE OF SIN

ON John's doctrine see Beyschlag, *N. T. Theol.* II. 2 § 3. Westcott on Epistles of John, p. 37.

The treatment of sin throughout the Scripture is not philosophical but practical. The emphasis is laid upon the fact and the remedy. The present chapter will treat of the teaching of the Gospel of John with reference to the origin, the nature, and the issue of sin. The doctrine is nowhere systematically and completely wrought out, but must be gathered from scattered hints and suggestions; and it will be found necessary in the course of the exposition to draw largely upon other portions of the New Testament by way of supplement and illustration.

i. *The Origin of Sin.*—The subject is nowhere distinctly treated, and it may appear to be the office of the expositor to start questions rather than to answer them; yet it is worth while to define the problem that we cannot solve, to see at least where the difficulty lies, and mark the boundaries of our knowledge.

Several propositions are constantly assumed.

(1) Sin had a beginning. There is in Scripture no trace of dualism, the gnostic doctrine that good and evil are alike eternal. "In the beginning God"—God alone. All things were made by Him, and His work is perfect. The finished creation He pronounced very good. Evil does not belong to the original constitution of the universe. As sin is lawlessness (*1 John 3:4*), it is subsequent to law. Augustine remarks, "If sin be natural, it is not sin at all" (*City of God 11:15*). It is unnatural, abnormal, lawless.

(2) Sin is a *personal* quality. It has no existence apart from personality. Scripture knows nothing of an *impersonal* principle of evil. The phrase indeed is without meaning, unless it signifies simply the *possibility* of evil. Good and evil are inseparable from character. However sin may be represented or personified, this personal property is always recognized. Like all abstract terms it denotes not being, but mode of being; not substance, but quality. There can no more be sin apart from a sinner than manhood apart from man. It is a personal state or condition. Good therefore is eternal, because God is eternal; but sin has had a beginning. As a state or mode of being, it can be predicated only of a person endowed with reason and will, possessed of knowledge and of freedom. Its origin must be sought in a personal act or choice. Personality is the only source and seat of sin. Thus

the field of our inquiry is narrowed to the sphere of intelligent being.

(3) God is not the author of sin. Since He only is from the beginning, indeed, whatever exists is traced back to Him. He is not the author of sin, but He is the author of the conditions under which sin originates. He not only permitted sin, but made it possible. The words of Isaiah 45:7,—“I make peace, and create evil,” like those of Amos 3:6—“Shall evil befall a city, and the Lord hath not done it?” are probably to be interpreted of penal and not moral evil. So Cheyne renders, “Who makes welfare, and creates calamity.” On Proverbs 16:4—“The Lord hath made everything for its own end; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil,”—Toy remarks, “The proverb declares, in a simple and direct way, the principle (recognized everywhere in the Old Testament) of the absoluteness of Yahweh’s government of the world, and it is added that every one of his acts has a definite purpose; since the wicked are punished, it is Yahweh who has created them to that end. This predestination of evil (to use the modern expression) is held in the Old Testament, without metaphysical speculation and without embarrassment, in connection with the belief in human freedom.” (*Intern. Comm. on Proverbs*. See Art. *Predestination* in Hastings’ B. D., Vol. 4, p. 50ff. On the doctrine of sin

throughout the Old Testament see Oehler, *O. T. Theol.* § 73, and Schultz, *O. T. Theol.* 2: 15.)

"If by the *Author of Sin* be meant the *Sinner*, the *Agent*, or *Actor of Sin*, or the *Doer* of a wicked thing; so it would be a reproach and blasphemy to suppose God to be the Author of Sin. In this sense, I utterly deny God to be the Author of Sin, rejecting such an imputation on the Most High, as what is infinitely to be abhorred; and deny any such thing to be the consequence of what I have laid down. But if by the *Author of Sin* is meant the permitter or not the hinderer of sin; and at the same time a disposer of the state of events, in such a manner, for wise, holy and most excellent ends and purposes, that sin, if it be permitted or not hindered will most certainly and infallibly follow: I say, if this is all that is meant by being the Author of Sin, I do not deny that God is the Author of Sin (though I dislike and reject the phrase, as that which by use and custom is apt to carry another sense), it is no reproach for the Most High to be thus the Author of Sin. This is not to be the *Actor of Sin*, but on the contrary, *of holiness*. What God doth herein is holy, and a glorious exercise of the infinite excellency of his nature" (Edwards, *On the Will*, iv. 9: 2).

"God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1: 5). All that proceeds from Him is pure. Sin is not the fruit of holiness, nor is

darkness born of light. Sin alone has come into being without the creative power of God, sin alone mars His work. Man brings evil out of good, God brings good out of evil, but evil is always abominable in His sight; and no view of His providence is justified which extenuates the guilt and heinousness of sin. That Adam's transgression was *felix culpa*, as it has been called, is wholly unscriptural. Nowhere is it taught that evil is a necessary stage in the evolution of good, but always that it is an alien and hostile power that must be overcome before good may reach its maturity.

(4) If then sin is not eternal, is not impersonal, and is not of God, sin entered through the creature, and of the creature was sin begotten. In creating free agents God introduced into the universe not sin but the possibility of sin. Either the will of God was thwarted by the will of man, and sin entered without His consent; or He created man with prevision of his sin, and sin exists by His permission. Jonathan Edwards has demonstrated with marvellous subtlety and force that God must foreknow the actions of free agents, or He cannot be the Ruler of the universe (*On the Will*, 2:11). Sin too was embraced within the divine purpose, has its part in the unfolding of the divine decree by which all things are ordered. Further than this neither Scripture nor reason conducts us. The theories framed to

resolve the mystery serve only to render darkness visible. A complete theodicy is beyond our power, and there is large room for the exercise of faith. How could God, infinite in holiness and power, permit sin to enter the universe? And how could sin originate with beings created holy? Logic affords no aid, for we cannot grasp the premises: infinite and eternal interests are involved. Speculation is lost in endless contradictions. God not only created man free, but suffered him to be tempted, and did not keep him from falling as He keeps the redeemed above. Why did He suffer man to be tempted, knowing that he would fall? It is true that men grow strong by battling with evil; that sin furnishes occasion for the exercise of the most gracious of God's attributes; that His mercy shines conspicuous against the dark background of human guilt. But if the pure in heart see God, is sin the necessary condition of the highest revelation; and must the mind of man be darkened and his soul defiled by sin, that he may attain the clearest vision of the divine? Could not man attain to perfect manhood without being exposed to temptation, as the children do in heaven? If in God's sight a soul outweighs a world, what can compensate for the myriads of souls destroyed by sin? These are questions that we cannot answer. To say that God could not prevent sin is to abridge His power; to say

that He would not seems to impeach His wisdom, His goodness, His holiness. As the ultimate purpose of God is holiness, we are forced to believe that in some strange way sin conduces to holiness, or that the conditions under which sin originates are of such value that they are worth purchasing even at so great a price. It is better to have free agency with sin than not to have it at all. The creature could not bear the image of the Creator unless he were endowed with freedom, and freedom involves the possibility and the power of sin. But the question recurs, and finds no answer, Would man have sinned if the tempter had not spoken? Why was the suggestion of evil permitted? Why was not the paradise below guarded like the paradise above, and our first parents shielded like the children who are taken to heaven before they feel the power of sin, and without a struggle grow to full stature in the likeness of God? Sin is the riddle of the universe, and He alone can solve it by whom the universe was made.

(5) Sin was not the original state of man. By nature he was the son of God, created in God's likeness, pure and holy. "God made man upright" (Eccles. 7:29). The flesh is not, as some have taught, primarily or inherently corrupt; for the flesh too is the handiwork of God. Matter has no moral character, and cannot of itself be evil, as the gnostics fancied; and

the sensuous nature of man though necessarily weak is not necessarily depraved. The flesh is not sin, but the seat of sin (Rom. 7: 17, 18). Sin is not a primal element in human nature, but a disease that has fastened upon it. The possibility of sin lay in the free will with which man was endowed. In his very likeness to God lay the power to assert himself against God.

It is obvious that if man was created holy, and is now sinful, he has fallen. The New Testament emphasizes not the historic fact that man fell, but the ethical fact that he is fallen. There are few references to the fall in Scripture. The Old Testament contains no direct allusion to it beyond the narrative in Genesis, unless it be in Job 31: 33—"If like Adam I covered my transgressions"—where the margin, "after the manner of men," is preferable; or in Hosea 6: 7<sup>1</sup>—"But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant" where again the rendering is very doubtful, and the margin reads "are as men that have transgressed a covenant;" or in Is. 43: 27—"Thy first father sinned," where the reference may be to Abraham or to Jacob. (See Hastings' B. D., Vol. I, page 840—Art. *Fall.*) In the New Testament the only explicit teaching regarding it is in Paul's Epistles (Rom. 5; 1 Cor. 15: 22;

<sup>1</sup> See the valuable discussion of this verse by Prof. B. B. Warfield in the *Bible Student* for July, 1903.

2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:13, 14); though, as will be seen, there are allusions to it elsewhere. Whether the record in Genesis is history or legend or myth or allegory it does not fall within our province to discuss. There can be no question that the New Testament writers interpreted it literally, and based their theology upon it. To Paul Adam was as real as Christ, the fall as real as the atonement. (See Sanday and Headlam on Romans, page 143, note—"St. Paul's conception of Sin and of the Fall.") The expositor must assume that Genesis is history, if he would hold the New Testament point of view. It may be maintained that the apostles were in error, but that this was their position cannot be denied. He who would interpret them must recognize, at least for the purposes of exposition, the literal truth of the narrative. Whether we should defer to their authority here as elsewhere is a question that lies beyond our present purpose, but it should be clearly understood that their authority, whatever weight we may attach to it, is unmistakably upon the side of the historical interpretation of the record.

By the New Testament as by the Old the sin of mankind is traced to a single root. The common condition has a common cause. This truth is not so fully developed by John as by Paul, but it is involved in the reference to the work of Satan, as will presently appear. The

question of the disciples, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" (9: 2), seems to point to the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, taught in Wisdom 8: 20—"But I was a clever child, and received a good soul. Yea rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled" (see Bissell's note); held by Philo, and according to Josephus by the Essenes, and subsequently by Origen. Or it may be that they conceived of sin as committed in the womb. But no form of the theory of prenatal sin finds countenance in Scripture; nor does the doctrine relieve the difficulty of the origin of sin, but simply throws it back and transports it to another sphere. We do not solve the problem by transferring it to a different time and place.

(6) Sin did not originate with man. There were rational creatures before man was created, there was sin before man fell. The fall of man is traced to the agency of Satan, and in him, so far as we are told, sin took its rise. All evil is traced to him, as all good to God. Man was tempted from without, the sin of Satan was his own. Therefore, as Thomas Aquinas teaches (II. 80, 4), is his sin beyond remedy, because it was due to no outward suggestion, but sprang from his own heart, conceived and brought forth by himself alone.<sup>1</sup> How sin could enter heaven,

<sup>1</sup> Compare the teaching of Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo* II. 21.

or originate in the breast of an archangel, without external suggestion or inward predisposition, is beyond our power to conceive.<sup>1</sup>

The fall of Satan if nowhere explicitly affirmed in Scripture is clearly implied. There are indeed only two alternatives: if he did not fall, he was created sinful, or he is eternal. If he was created holy, and is now sinful, he must have fallen. When we turn to the Scripture, the passages which bear upon the subject are few. Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2: 4 refer to a sin of angels, but whether to the original apostasy is doubtful. It should be remarked that the citation of the book of Enoch by Jude neither affirms the inspiration of the one nor casts a shadow upon the inspiration of the other. Jude may quote from an apocryphal book as Paul from a heathen poet, and in either case it is simply the truth of the statement that is affirmed. It is cited not as Scripture but as true. In Luke 10: 18—"I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," Jesus speaks of the destruction of Satan's dominion among men, foreshadowed in the casting out of demons by the disciples. *Heaven* is a figurative designation of the high place of power; as in verse 15 it symbolizes the height of privilege and blessing—"And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?"—though here indeed

<sup>1</sup> On the O. T. doctrine of Satan see Oehler, § 200, and Schultz, 2: 13.

the literal sense of the word may also be involved, as is suggested by the reference to the judgment day in the verse preceding. Temporal afflictions are a prophecy of the final judgment. Similar is the use of the term in the portrayal of the overthrow of the king of Babylon in Is. 14: 12—"How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning!" and in Eph. 6: 12—"Our wrestling is . . . against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." The war in heaven of Rev. 12 follows upon the birth of Christ, and issues in the destruction of Satan's kingdom through Him, as in John 12: 31—"Now shall the prince of this world be cast out," and 16: 11—"The prince of this world hath been judged." There remain only two passages in the New Testament which may be referred to the fall of Satan. (a) John 8: 44—"He was a murderer from the beginning, and stood not in the truth, because there is no truth in him." The text of the second clause is doubtful. If, with the American revisers and the margin of the Revised Version, we read *οὐχ ἔστηκεν*, the perfect of *ἴστημι*, with the sense of the present, *standeth not*, the reference is simply to his present state, with no allusion to the past. If, with the Revised Version, following the text of W. H. and the apparent weight of manuscript authority, we read *οὐκ ἔστηκεν*, the imperfect of *στῆκω*, *stood not*, there is an obvious reference to

his fall. He was originally in the truth, but did not continue in it, because it ceased to be congenial to him. Not to love the truth is to lose the truth, for truth is for the truthful. The words refer therefore at once to his fall, and to the condition that determined his fall, a condition which is become absolute and permanent—"there is no truth in him." Not now the truth but the lie is the sphere in which he lives and acts.

(b) 1 Tim. 3 : 6. The bishop must not be a "novice, lest being puffed up he fall into the condemnation of the devil." *τοῦ διαβόλου* may be the genitive of the subject or of the object; the condemnation may be that which the devil imposes, or that which he suffers. The second sense is to be preferred, as more in harmony with the general scope of New Testament teaching; for, as Bengel notes, "The devil may bring a reproach upon men, he cannot bring them into condemnation, for he does not judge, but is judged." The phrase "being puffed up" intimates that the sin by which Satan fell was pride, as the Authorized Version expressly renders, "being puffed up with pride." It is difficult, indeed, to conceive of other motives that could have actuated him than pride and ambition. This the poets have recognized, Cædmon, Dante, Milton, Shakespeare. According to a doubtful reading of Ecclesiasticus, "Pride is the beginning of sin"

(10:13. See the treatment of this passage by Thos. Aquinas, II. 84: 2).

Even if we should follow the prevalent opinion of early Jewish and Christian interpreters, as represented by Josephus, Philo, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Book of Enoch, Tertullian, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Methodius, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, Sulpitius Severus, that the sons of God who took to them the daughters of men (Gen. 6: 2) were angels,<sup>1</sup> the passage can have no reference to Satan, for he fell before man was created.

Thus it appears that of the two passages of the New Testament which may refer to the fall of Satan the text of one and the interpretation of the other are in doubt. Yet in each case the probability favors the doctrine, and allowing due weight to the general considerations already noted we may conclude that the fall of Satan is sufficiently attested by Scripture.

The single allusion to the agency of Satan in the fall of man in this Gospel is found in 8:44—“He was a murderer from the beginning.” The words may be referred to the death of Abel (1 John 3:12). It is no serious objection to this

<sup>1</sup> See the Comms. of Delitzsch and Dillmann in loc. Cunningham in his *Historical Theology*, 6: 1, strangely represents Justin as the author of this interpretation. Purves correctly remarks that “he is the first of the Church fathers to accept the legend” (*Justin Martyr*, p. 158). See Lenormant’s *Beginnings of History*, ch. 7.

view that the deed of Cain is not ascribed to the instigation of Satan in the narrative of Genesis; for his personality and agency are not fully disclosed in the Old Testament. But in this passage murder is associated with lying, and the phrase "*from the beginning*" points to the primary act from which the death of the race proceeds. "The devil sinneth from the beginning"—of human history (1 John 3: 8). That he was moved by envy of man's blissful estate was a common opinion among the Jews (Wisdom 2: 23, 24—"For God created man for immortality, and made him to be an image of his own being; but through envy of the devil came death into the world"; Josephus, *Antiq.* I. I § 4), and accords with his nature. Pride turned him against God, and envy against man.

The names given to him are indicative of his character. In the Gospel *Satan* occurs only in 13: 27—"And after the sop, then entered Satan into him." It signifies adversary. He is the enemy of God and man. Peter terms him *ἀντίδικος*, your adversary (1 Peter 5: 8). Again he is termed devil, slanderer (8: 44; 13: 2). He slanders God to man (Gen. 3), and man to God (Job 1: 9-11; 2: 4, 5). In Rev. 12: 10 he appears as the accuser of God's people, *κατήγωρ*; as in Zech. 3: 1 he appeared before God as the adversary of the high priest. Throughout the New Testament *διάβολος* is used only as a proper

name, except in the Pastoral Epistles. It is applied to Judas because he was the servant of the devil (6: 70), as Peter was called Satan (Matt. 16: 23). The serpent is identified with Satan as his instrument (Rev. 12: 9; 20: 2). In Rom. 16: 20—"The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly," Paul renews the promise of Gen. 3: 15, that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. He is also termed *the evil one*. "I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one" (17: 15; 1 John 2: 13, 14; 3: 12; 5: 18, 19). In the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer the Revised Version properly reads, "deliver us from the evil one." (See the excellent remarks of Broadus on Matt. 6: 13.) He is wholly and absolutely depraved. "All good to me is lost. Evil, be thou my good." Since he is the prince of evil, the ruler of the kingdom of darkness, man by the fall became subject to his power. He is the prince of this world (12: 31; 14: 30; 16: 11). Paul even calls him the god of this world (2 Cor. 4: 4), so absolute is his lordship over the souls of men. The world lies in him, as the believer is in God (1 John 5: 19, 20).

Since evil men are swayed by him, and bear his likeness, he is termed their father; though as the relation is purely ethical they are never said to be begotten of him. There is thus no contra-

diction in affirming that men are by nature the children of God as created by Him in His own image, and the children of Satan in so far as they yield to sin. Admirable are the words of Augustine—"From thence (the family of darkness) also they (the Manicheans) say our flesh derives its origin, and accordingly think the Lord said, 'Ye are of your father the devil,' because they were evil, as it were, by nature. . . . For every nature is good, but man's nature has been corrupted by an evil will. . . . How then were the Jews the children of the devil? By imitation, not by birth. Listen to the usual language of the Holy Scriptures. The prophet says to those very Jews, 'Thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother a Hittite' (Ezek. 16: 3). The Amorites were not a nation that gave origin to the Jews. The Hittites also were themselves of a nation altogether different from the race of the Jews. But because the Amorites and Hittites were impious, and the Jews imitated their impiety, they found parents for themselves, not of whom they were born, but in whose damnation they should share, because following their customs. . . . But listen now to what the Lord says, "Ye," said He, "are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." This is how ye are his children, because such are your lusts, not because ye are born of him. . . . 'He that is of God heareth God's words; ye

therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.' Here again it is not of their nature as men, but of their depravity, that you are to think. In this way they are of God, and yet not of God. . . . They are both of God, and not of God. By nature they are of God; by depravity they are not of God; for the good nature which is of God sinned voluntarily by believing the persuasive words of the devil, and was corrupted. . . . They are of God, and yet not of God, in the same way as the children of Abraham, and yet not the children of Abraham. . . . He who said, 'ye are the children of Abraham,' Himself denied that they were the children of Abraham. 'If ye are Abraham's children, do the deeds of Abraham. . . . Ye do the works of your father,' that is, of the devil. . . . They were both Abraham's children in their carnal origin, and not his children in the sin of following the persuasion of the devil. So also apply it to our Lord and God, that they were both of Him, and not of Him. How were they of Him? Because it was He that created the man of whom they were born. . . . Because He is the architect of nature, Himself the creator of flesh and spirit. How then were they not of Him? Because they had made themselves depraved. They were no longer of Him because, imitating the devil, they had become the children of the devil" (Tract. on John 42: 10-15).

This relation to Satan which Jesus ascribed to the Jews in 8:44, John in his Epistles ascribes to all unbelievers. Men are by nature the children of God; by the choice of evil they become the children of the devil. "He that doeth sin is of the devil" (1 John 3:8). He is the tempter of mankind, of Adam (8:44), and of Christ. "The prince of the world cometh; and he hath nothing in me" (14:30). "'Is of the devil.' Ye know what he means; by imitating the devil. For the devil made no man, begat no man, created no man; but whoso imitates the devil, that person, as if begotten of him, becomes a child of the devil; by imitating him, not literally by being begotten of him" (Augustine, Hom. on 1 John 4:10). The relation of man to God is both natural and ethical; the relation of man to Satan is ethical alone. Sin can be termed natural only in the sense that habit is second nature.

He is a liar and a murderer, deceiving and destroying. Through deceit he "brought death into the world and all our woe." Various explanations are given of the sentence, "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar and the father thereof" (8:44). The Manicheans rendered, "He is a liar, and so is his father." The margin of the Revised Version reads, "When one speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for his father also is a liar." But as the subject of the verb *speaketh* is not expressed,

it is better to understand the subject of the preceding sentence, *the devil*. Then *he is the father thereof* may mean either he is the father of the lie or the father of the liar. Augustine defends the former interpretation with much ingenuity. "It is not every one who tells a lie that is the father of his lie. For if thou hast got a lie from another, and uttered it, thou indeed hast lied, but thou are not the father of that lie, because thou hast got it from another. But the devil was a liar of himself. He begat his own falsehood; he heard it from no one. As God the Father begat as His Son the Truth, so the devil having fallen begat falsehood as his son. He is both a liar and the father of lies." The connection indeed may appear to favor the other interpretation—He is a liar, and the father of the liar, that is, of all liars; and this seems to be the prevailing view among scholars. Jesus affirms that the Jews are children of Satan as murderers, seeking to kill him, and as liars. Yet both the grammar and the partiality of the Gospel for abstract terms point to *the lie* as the antecedent; and the personal reference is not lost. Because murder and lying originate with Satan, he is the father of murderers and liars. In any case the construction is harsh.

It was the purpose of Christ's ministry to destroy the works of the devil as the head and representative of evil (1 John 3:8). Regarded

ideally, as the inevitable issue, He accomplished it by His death: "that through death he might bring to naught him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). Then was the prince of this world condemned (16:11), and cast out (12:31). But it is actually consummated by His second coming in glory.

Lampe remarks, "Scripture speaks of a three-fold judgment of Satan, the first in paradise, the second in the passion and death of Christ, the third in the end of the world." The first is the sentence pronounced, the second and third are the initial and the final execution of the sentence. (See 2 Thess. 1:7-10; 2:7-9.)

To the questions already raised, Why was man exposed to temptation? Why was not the gate of Eden guarded by the cherubim and the flaming sword before man fell? the answer commonly returned is drawn from the relation of temptation to character. All intelligent creatures, angels and men, so far as we know, with one large exception to be noted presently, are exposed to temptation, that character may be developed and established, that innocence may pass over into the deliberate choice of good. It must be observed that temptation is thus regarded as essential, but not yielding to temptation. If man had resisted and overcome the allurements of evil, his progress would have been far more rapid. Sin has been a burden and a

fetter upon the powers of body, soul, and spirit. Satan promised that the eyes of our first parents should be opened to behold good and evil, and the promise was partially fulfilled; for it may be said, relatively speaking, that their eyes were opened to evil and closed to good as before they had been open to good and closed to evil. They saw the earth cursed for their sakes; they saw their nakedness, and were ashamed; their guilt, and were afraid. It is not temptation, but battling with temptation, that makes men strong.

But the answer is not sufficient. It must be confessed that the case of those who die in infancy is not easily adjusted to our philosophical and theological systems. They form an immense proportion of the race, and the kingdom of heaven is theirs; yet in our consideration alike of providence and of grace they are often forgotten. No system is complete which does not provide for them; no principle of the divine administration can be maintained in which they are not embraced. Scripture makes no direct affirmation concerning them, and we are forced to believe either that a period of probation is allowed them thereafter, which is out of harmony with the general teaching of the Word; or that their destiny is fixed without a conscious personal choice. If then they are never put upon probation, nor exposed to evil, how can we

assert that temptation is essential to the development of character? If they, born of a sinful race, have no need of temptation to strengthen and refine, what need had Adam, created holy? If in them evil may be eradicated and good augmented without conflict with sin, why might not he have been trained and developed without it? To these questions we have no answer. We can only say that while the salvation and sanctification of infants demonstrates that temptation is not essential to the formation of character, yet it is the method which God ordinarily employs, and must therefore in the final outcome approve itself the best. When reason cannot demonstrate that it is the best way, and therefore God's way, faith is content to believe that it is God's way, and therefore the best.

The problem of the origin of sin is unsolved, insoluble, upon the side of the creature and of the Creator. What could give birth to evil in the breast of beings created holy, in a realm of which holiness was the universal law? How could God suffer sin to mar His work, destroy His creatures, break the harmony of heaven, fasten itself upon the universe forever, create hell? Reason is baffled, faith perplexed. We can only rest in the belief that sin too exists by His permission, is subject to His control, and in some way shall be made to serve the ends of wisdom and holiness and grace.

2. *The Nature of Sin.*—On Old Testament names for sin see Schultz, *O. T. Theol.* 2: 14.

Numerous terms are employed in the New Testament to designate sin in its different phases and characteristics, a fearful evidence of its prevalence and power. Trench gives the following list of nine (*N. T. Syn.*, § 66), to which others might be added, ἀμαρτία, ἀμάρτημα, παρακοή, ἀνομία, παρανομία, παράβασις, παράπτωμα, ἀγνόημα, ἥττημα. Among them all John uses only the most comprehensive, ἀμαρτία. Like the common Hebrew term it signifies literally *missing the mark*, and denotes intellectual or moral error. In the New Testament it is used only in the ethical sense. Elsewhere John furnishes the most exact definition of sin given in Scripture—"Sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3: 4), "any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God." This contradicts the theories that sin is essential to the constitution or development of man or of the universe; that it is a normal stage of growth, the childhood of character, "good in the making"; that it is mere limitation or imperfection, the necessary condition of the creature.<sup>1</sup> It is not incomplete or imperfect good. Nor is it simple ignorance. Where there is ignorance there is no sin. "If ye were blind, ye would have no sin," said Jesus

<sup>1</sup> On the various theories of sin see Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, § 92ff., Hodge's *Syst. Theol.* II, ch. 8.

to the Pharisees (9: 41). "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin. . . . If I had not done among them the works which none other did, they had not had sin" (15: 22, 24). Men do not sin because they are in darkness, they are in darkness because they sin. "Men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their deeds were evil" (3: 19). Sin is not the fruit of ignorance, but ignorance is the fruit of sin. The assumption that an enlightened self-interest is the remedy for sin, that men are naturally inclined to good and will cease to do evil as soon as they are led to see the advantages of virtue, is contradicted by all history and experience. Ignorance, it should be observed, is comparative only, for no man is wholly devoid of the knowledge of God's will. The law is written upon the heart. Honest doubt is recognized, and the way of escape is shown. "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be from God, or whether I speak from myself" (7: 17). By obedience the senses are exercised and trained to discern good and evil, and God reveals His truth and His will to men with growing clearness as they are prepared to receive and to obey. Our Lord's treatment of Thomas illustrates the wisdom and the kindness with which He deals with the doubter. But doubt is tolerable only in so far as it is sin-

cere and docile. Unbelief is the fruit of a sinful heart. Men love the darkness because it hides their evil deeds. All men have or may have such knowledge of the will of God that their sin is without excuse. When Paul says, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. 1:13), he represents his ignorance not as a claim upon God's justice, but as an occasion for His mercy.

Jesus said to Pilate, "Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above; therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin" (19:11). "*He that delivered me unto thee*" is not Judas, but Caiaphas, the representative of the Jewish people; for it was he by whom Jesus was brought before the governor. Then the question arises, How does the fact that Pilate holds his authority from God, by whom civil government is ordained, affect the guilt of Caiaphas? The passage may be interpreted in two ways. *Greater sin* may mean, greater than it otherwise would be. The sin of Caiaphas is enhanced by the fact that he seeks to prostitute the judicial authority of Pilate, derived from God, to his own evil ends. Or it may mean, the sin of Caiaphas is greater than thine. The judge was compelled by virtue of his office to take action in the case, while the high priest entered upon the prosecution of his own free will. His sin is therefore the more

heinous because it springs from a wilful malevolence in which Pilate has no part. This interpretation is to be preferred. "He indeed delivered me to thy power at the bidding of envy, whilst thou art to exercise thy power upon me through the impulse of fear" (Augustine in loc.).

As God is light, sin is often described as darkness. The term is never applied in the Gospel to simple ignorance, but has always an ethical sense. In 1:5—"The light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehendeth it not," the margin of the Revised Version reads *overcame* for *apprehended*. But *apprehended* is better, for it answers to *knew him not* and *received him not* of verses ten and eleven. The darkness apprehends the light by appropriating it; then it becomes light—"Ye were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord" (Eph. 5:8); as the light may become darkness—"If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness" (Matt. 6:23). The contrast between light and darkness is drawn in 3:19; 11:9, 10; 12:35, 46; and in 1 John 1:5-7; 2:8-11.

Again sin is described as bondage. "Every one that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin" (8:34). When the Jews boasted of their freedom, Jesus did not remind them of the Roman yoke, but of the servitude of sin, and bade them seek freedom through the truth, the Son (8:32-36). This conception of sin is common

## 210 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

in the New Testament (Rom 6: 16; 2 Peter 2: 19).

As the knowledge of God is life eternal (17: 3), and he who sinneth hath not seen Him nor known Him (1 John 3: 6), sin is death. Because all have sinned, death has passed upon all. To believe is to be translated from death to life (5: 24). "He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life" (1 John 5: 12). "He that loveth not *abideth* in death" (1 John 3: 14). Men live in the spirit only as they are quickened by the Son. We are not by nature alive awaiting death, but dead awaiting life (5: 21ff.). Since the heinousness of sin is measured by the degree of light enjoyed, the rejection of Christ, who is the light, the supreme and perfect revelation of God, is the crowning sin. It is the sin against the remedy. "He that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God" (3: 18). "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins," said Jesus to the Jews (8: 24). "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God *abideth* on him" (3: 36).

Sin attaches primarily not to conduct but to character, not to the act but to the disposition from which the act proceeds. The view that sin may be predicated only of voluntary acts is alike superficial and unscriptural. The nature that is estranged from God and inclined to evil is sinful,

to whatever cause that condition may be ascribed, and sin belongs to man by birth. It is true, as Jonathan Edwards has shown, that "the Essence of the Virtue and Vice of Dispositions of the Heart, and Acts of the Will, lies not in their Cause, but their Nature" (*On the Will*, Part IV, Sec. 1). Good and evil belong not to the will alone, but to the whole nature of man. The Psalmist speaks truth—"I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (51: 5. On the place of this doctrine in the Old Testament see Schultz, *O. T. Theol.* 2: 15, 3). The words of Jesus regarding the children, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 19: 14), do not signify that they are without sin. It is often held indeed that He does not speak of children at all, but only of the childlike. So Meyer and Broadus. But if the childlike are approved because they possess the virtues of children, how can the children themselves be excluded? The words include children and those who have the spirit of children. So Calvin teaches (*Instt.* Bk. IV, ch. 16: 7). We are nearer God and heaven in early years than we shall ever be again by nature; for then the germs of evil are undeveloped, and the soul is most easily turned to righteousness. Disposition has not hardened into character. Human nature appears at its best in them.

The heart is the fountain whence all sins proceed. Lust is the adultery of the heart, covet-

ousness is the theft of the heart, hatred is the murder of the heart (Matt. 5 : 22, 28). "That which proceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed"—and the long catalogue unfolds (Mark 7 : 21). Sins are the fruit of sin. Scripture constantly assumes that corruption of the whole nature which in the language of theology is termed original sin. Total depravity may be affirmed of man, not in the sense that he is as bad as he can be, which we dare affirm of no one in this life, but in the sense that every part of his nature is corrupted and defiled by sin; and that this corruption, if it be not arrested, will become absolute. So we might speak of a man as wholly diseased, if every organ of his body was affected by a fatal malady, even though that malady had not yet reached its height. The term expresses therefore at once a fact and a tendency. It is not true that there is in man by nature nothing good. There are remnants of original righteousness, and every man enjoys in some measure the influence of the Holy Spirit. If he were wholly evil, there would be nothing for God to appeal to, nothing for Him to lay hold of, no point of moral contact between God and man. But there is in man no good sufficient to constitute a claim upon God's justice when set over against his sin, to merit salvation, or to shape his character. The

dominant and controlling power, the power that in the course of nature fashions his life and determines his destiny, is sin.

Sin is the universal state of mankind. The law made known with greater or less clearness to all men is obeyed by none. Sin attaches to human nature not originally or of necessity, but actually and universally. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"; and there is need of the new birth of the Spirit.

How sin is transmitted Scripture nowhere defines. Neither creationism nor traducianism, the theories that have divided theology, furnishes a sufficient answer.<sup>1</sup> Traducianism, which maintains that the soul is propagated with the body, leans strongly towards materialism, and ascribes to man a creative power which belongs to God alone. For a recent defense of traducianism see Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 217. Creationism, which maintains that every soul is a separate and distinct creation of the Almighty, breaks the continuity of the race, ignores the law of heredity, and comes perilously near to making God the author of sin. The difficulty that Augustine raised regarding children (Letter 166) is not easily answered by creationism. "If new souls are made for men, individually, at their birth, I do not see, on the one hand, that they

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott on Hebrews, additional note on 4: 12.

could have any sin while yet in infancy, nor do I believe, on the other hand, that God condemns any soul which He sees to have no sin." If the soul is born of God, how can it sin before it begins to exercise its freedom? What need have infants of regeneration? To suppose that the soul contracts sin by mere contact with the body is gross materialism. Each theory contains a portion of the truth. In the complex process of the physical as of the spiritual birth God and man cooperate. All life is of God, but the conditions under which the life comes into being, the forces that shape it, are in large degree of man. The life is divinely implanted under human conditions. The soul derives its being from God, its moral quality from man. Here we touch the limits of our thought. That I am, as a creature, is of God; that I am what I am, as a sinner, is of man. The problems that beset the origin of life are insoluble, but no theory is justified which does not recognize both the creative agency of God and the vital unity of the race. Life is at once a creation and an inheritance. If in this we seem to be dealing with words rather than with things, it must be remembered that it is often the office of the expositor simply to expose our ignorance. It may be as real a service, though less fruitful, to define the boundaries of our knowledge as to extend them, and the elimination of error clears the way for the discovery of truth.

That sin is universal is indicated by the use of the term *the world*. It is employed by John in two ethical senses. (*a*) The mass of mankind as alienated from God. In 1:10 the physical and the ethical senses are set side by side,—“He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.” To the world all men belong by nature. (*b*) The scene and sphere in which sinful humanity lives and acts. “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof” (1 John 2:15, 16). In the broadest sense the world is the mass of sinful men with all that issues from them and pertains to them.

The world thus embraces all mankind as sinful and condemned, except those whom Christ has called out of the world. He constantly distinguished Himself and His disciples from the world. Throughout chapters fourteen to seventeen the distinction underlies His discourse to them and His prayer on their behalf. “If ye were of the world, the world would love its own, but because ye are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you” (15:19). “They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world” (17:16). The

world is sinful and condemned, believers are sinful and redeemed. The difference between them is not of nature but of grace. "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you" (15: 16). Though God loves the world, and the Lamb of God has been offered to take away the sin of the world, the world still lies in the evil one (1 John 5: 19), and the Spirit convicts the world of sin (16: 8).

3. *The Issue of Sin.*—The sinner is already condemned. The wrath of God *abideth* upon him that believeth not. To believe is to turn from death to life. "He that believeth not hath been judged already" (3: 18). Men are not free from condemnation until they reject Christ, they are under condemnation until they accept Christ. They are not innocent until they turn to sin, but guilty until they turn to God. "Unbelief retains all sins, as faith removes all sins" (Luther, following Augustine, *au quia peccata omnia per infidelitatem tenentur, per fidem dimituntur?*—because all sins are retained by unbelief, are they removed by faith?—a question which he answers affirmatively. Sermon 144). Sin and guilt belong to us by nature.

Sin is punished in this life, for all the evils that befall us are the fruit of sin. When Jesus healed the man who had been thirty and eight years in his infirmity, He bade him "Sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee" (5: 14). But particular afflictions do not always spring from specific

sins, nor is the suffering of the individual the measure of his guilt. This was the error of the friends of Job. When the disciples asked, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" Jesus answered, "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents." That is, his blindness is not due to any peculiar sin on his part or on theirs (9: 2, 3). The same truth is taught in Luke 13: 1-5, with reference to the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and the eighteen on whom the tower in Siloam fell. Part of our distresses must be referred to the conduct of others, and part to the disordered condition of the world in which we live. The prayer of John for Gaius, "that in all things thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth" (3 John 2), is in harmony with the great law of the universe, that condition waits on character, fortune is measured by desert. But in this present evil world that law often appears to be baffled and thwarted for a time. Because there is yet evil in the good, they are chastened; and because there is yet good in the evil, space for amendment is granted them. God's chastisements sanctify the righteous, and His goodness leads sinners to repentance. His purpose is primarily not to make men happy, but to make them holy, and the administration of His providence is directed to that end. His kingdom is first righteousness, then peace and

joy. It is obvious that the strict and immediate application of the law of reward and punishment would rob the present life of its character as a discipline and a probation. "For if every sin were now visited with manifest punishment, nothing would seem to be reserved for the final judgment; on the other hand, if no sin received now a plainly divine punishment, it would be concluded that there is no divine providence at all" (*Augustine, City of God, I: 8*). It is true of the general course of the divine administration that mercy triumphs over judgment. God does not deal with men according to their desert, but according to His purpose of grace in Jesus Christ.

It is of the nature of sin to proceed from bad to worse. Character inclines to completeness, to become in fact what it is in temper and tendency. Habits are formed, and are the moulds into which character is run. Destiny is character in its fixed and final form. Hardening befalls the sinner if he persists in sin. "He hath blinded their eyes," said Isaiah, "and he hardened their hearts; lest they should see with their eyes, and perceive with their heart, and should turn, and I should heal them" (12: 40). The cause of this hardening Jesus (Matt. 13: 14) and Paul (Acts 28: 26) find in the people, and John in God. They present different aspects of one complex truth. As the eye diseased becomes unable to respond to

the light, the moral nature abused becomes unable to respond to the divine Spirit. *Will not* issues in *cannot*. Since the laws of nature are ordained of God, whatever results from their operation, in the realm of matter or of spirit, is properly ascribed to Him. Moreover, there are times when God withdraws His Spirit from men, and lets them go on their way unhindered (Gen. 6: 3; Ps. 81: 12; Hos. 4: 17; Rom. 1: 28; 2 Thess. 2: 10, 11). Thus it is said that Pharaoh hardened his heart (Ex. 7: 22; 8: 15, 32), and that God hardened it (Ex. 10: 20, 27). When he resisted every warning, rejected every overture, mocked at chastisement, God said, Let him alone. Let him follow the path he has chosen to the bitter end. It is only the Spirit of God that keeps men from rushing upon destruction, and if the Spirit is withdrawn their doom is sealed. The hardening begins with man. God hardens the hardened. Jesus bade Judas, "That thou doest, do quickly" (13: 27), because he had reached the point where there was no hope of repentance.

The ultimate issue of sin is eternal death. Both life and death are represented as present, and at the same time as consummated in the world to come. The doctrine of the future state will be treated in the chapter on the End of All Things, and the *sin unto death* in the chapter on the New Life.

## 220 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

From the state of darkness, of bondage, of corruption, of death, into which man has fallen by reason of sin, and from which he has no power to deliver himself, God has provided a way of salvation through the life and death of His only begotten Son.

## VIII

### SALVATION

IN the Synoptic Gospels the chief good is commonly represented as the kingdom of heaven, a phrase peculiar to Matthew, or of God; though eternal life is occasionally named. With Paul it is salvation, the kingdom of God, life. With John it is almost exclusively life, life eternal. *Kingdom of God* occurs only in 3:3, 5, where Jesus would meet Nicodemus on familiar ground; and *my kingdom* in 18:36, in answer to the question of Pilate, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" *Salvation* and *Savior* are found each but once in the Gospel (4:22, 42)—and *save* in the ethical sense only four times (3:17; 5:34; 10:9; 12:47). But life—(ἡ) ζωή—is of frequent occurrence, and is used always in the highest sense of life spiritual and eternal. John uses the word thirty-six times in the Gospel, and *life eternal* seventeen times; while in the earlier Gospels *life* is found fifteen times, and *eternal life* eight times—always in the ethical sense, except in Luke 16:25—"Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things." The distinction between ζωή and βίος is admirably drawn by Lightfoot in his note on the Epistle of Ignatius

to the Romans 7. "If  $\zeta\omega\eta$  is sometimes used of the earthly life,  $\betaios$  is never used of the heavenly. This distinction holds in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, not less than in the New Testament. It is founded on an essential difference between the two words, recognized by Greek philosophers; but to the Christian their relative position is exchanged, because his point of view is altered. As  $\zeta\omega\eta$  is the principle of life, *vita qua vivimus*,  $\betaios$  denotes the process, the circumstances, the accidents of life, in its social and physical relations, *vita quam vivimus*. . . . But in Christian philosophy the principle of life is not physical, but spiritual; and thus while  $\betaios$  remains at its former level,  $\zeta\omega\eta$  has been translated into a higher sphere, and takes the precedence." See also Trench, *N. T. Syn.*, § 27.  $\betaios$  occurs in John only in 1 John 2:16—"the vain glory of *life*"—and 3:17—"the world's *goods*."

This is the life which is life indeed (1 Tim. 6:19). The emphasis should fall not upon *eternal* but upon *life*. It is not *duration* but *quality* of being that the phrase primarily denotes. Only when life is understood in its high spiritual import can immortality be counted a blessing. To the wicked it is eternal death.

All life is of God. He alone hath life in Himself, life original and underived. In creation and in regeneration life is imparted to men through

the Son. The Father gives life to the Son, the Son gives life to men. "For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself" (5:26). "In him was life; and the life was the light of men" (1:4). "As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me" (6:57). "God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son" (1 John 5:11). This life is begotten in men by the Holy Spirit, "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2). It is imparted to men from the Father by the Son through the Spirit.

The earlier Gospels and Paul usually represent eternal life as future, John represents it as present. They teach that salvation *issues* in eternal life, John teaches that salvation *is* eternal life. "He that heareth my words and believeth him that sent me, *hath* eternal life" (5:24). "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath* eternal life" (6:54). "He that hath the Son *hath* the life." "These things have I written unto you, that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye *have* eternal life" (1 John 5:12, 13). John thus dwells characteristically on the inner and vital aspect of salvation, while the outer and forensic, familiar to Paul, is hardly touched. Yet he recognizes that this life has its processes, its stages, its consummation. The clearer the vision of God, the

richer and fuller is the life. "It is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is" (1 John 3:2).

The new life begins with the new birth, consists essentially in the knowledge of God, is consummated in the world to come, and endures forever.

In the work of salvation both God and man bear a part.

(A) The part of God. Each of the Persons of the Trinity is engaged, and salvation involves the good pleasure of the Father, the atonement of the Son, the regeneration of the Spirit.

i. The good pleasure of the Father. This is the source and spring of all that is good and true. All power in the last analysis is will-power, and the ultimate force of the universe in the realm of matter and of spirit is the will of the Almighty.

To His pleasure are referred creation—"Thou didst create all things, and because of thy will they were, and were created" (Rev. 4:11); and redemption—"Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will" (Eph. 1:5). "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth" (Jas. 1:18. Compare Matt. 11:25, 26; Eph. 1:9). In salvation it is shown—

(1) In the gift of His Son. Jesus gathered up the gospel in a single sentence—"God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (3 : 16). Here is set forth the ground of salvation, the love of God ; the object, the world ; the means, the gift of His Son ; the condition, faith ; the fruit, eternal life. Calvin finds in these words the efficient cause of eternal life, the grace of God ; the material cause, Christ and His obedience ; the instrumental cause, faith (*Instt.* III. 14, 17).

(2) In the election of men. He gives His Son for men, He gives them to His Son. Saints are chosen from the beginning, called through the gospel (2 Thess. 2 : 13, 14). Those whom Jesus chose on earth were given Him of the Father (6 : 37, 65 ; 10 : 29 ; 17 : 2, 6, 9. Compare Eph. 1 : 4). In 17 : 2 the distinction is drawn between *all flesh*, which Jesus rules, and *those whom thou hast given me*, whom He saves. Those that the Father gives to the Son He draws to Him. "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (6 : 44, 65). The word indicates that man's freedom is not destroyed. It is evident from the verses following that this drawing consists in teaching, the teaching of the Word and the Spirit. "Behold how He draws : They shall be all taught of God ! This is God's drawing. Every man that hath heard and hath

## 226 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

learned of the Father cometh unto Me ! This is God's drawing " (Augustine).

Nowhere is it taught that all men are drawn alike. In 6: 45, " They shall be all taught of God," believers only are spoken of; for that is evidently the meaning of the prophet—" all *thy children*" (Is. 54: 13). " All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me " (6: 37). There is a divine determination underlying and conditioning but not destroying human freedom. The course of providence is one long process of discrimination, and the doctrine of election is imbedded in the history of the race. Faith is not the cause but the effect of grace. We are not chosen because we believe, we believe because we are chosen. It is forever true, Ye did not choose me, but I chose you—and, We love because he first loved us.

The doctrine is sometimes presented in a harsh and repulsive form, and pushed to an unscriptural and irrational extreme. Several considerations should be borne in mind which may serve to relieve if they cannot remove the difficulties which it presents.

(a) The will of God is not arbitrary, for it is the expression of His character. The discrimination which He exercises among men is not capricious, but is directed by infinite wisdom and love. His will is His nature in action. His good pleasure must not be interpreted to mean

that He acts without reason, for all His action has regard to the welfare of the universe over which He presides ; but the reasons which sweep so vast a field may lie beyond the reach of our understanding.

(b) Election to salvation involves election to service. There may be real or apparent exceptions to this law in the present life, but in view of the life to come and the service that awaits us there, we may affirm that the principle is universally true. And it is ordinarily true even here. Underlying the particular election of individuals is the general purpose of the redemption of the world. Our Lord's prayer for His disciples embraces the petition that through them the world may be won to knowledge and to faith. The election of the individual is in order to the salvation of the race. "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you, and appointed you"—why? "that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit may abide" (15 : 16). That is the law of the kingdom from the beginning, strikingly illustrated in the call of Abraham, in whom all the families of the earth should be blessed. When Israel refused to enter upon the worldwide mission to which God summoned them, they ceased to be the people of God. Salvation and service, faith and works, are inseparable in the godly life. When God has a message for men, in science, in art, in religion, He does not write it on the face

of the sky, or declare it from the open heavens. He whispers it to student, or poet, or artist, or prophet, and bids him, What thou hast heard in the ear, proclaim on the house-tops. The method of His grace is analogous to the method of His providence.

(c) Divine election does not annul human freedom. If the liberty of man is impaired, it is not by reason of God's sovereignty, but by reason of his own sin. It is better to speak of the freedom of man than of the freedom of the will. Much confusion has resulted from ascribing to a single faculty what belongs to the whole personality. The will cannot be detached and isolated, even in our thought. Thought and feeling and will are personal functions and the person is one. If the man be enslaved, how can the will be free? "Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin" (8: 34). Every motion of the reason, the conscience, the affections, is reflected in the will, and it is swayed even by bodily states and outward conditions. Our conduct is the resultant of many forces, within and without. This indicates at once the difficulty of framing a consistent theory of human freedom, whether in philosophy or in theology. To define the nature and the limits of our liberty, to determine in what sense and in what measure we are free, is a task beyond our power. What is the area of the freedom that is bounded on one

side by the sovereignty of God, and on the other by the corruption of our nature? There is no such thing in the universe, so far as we know, as a will in equilibrium, a nature without bias. The only possible freedom is liberty to act according to the nature that we possess. God Himself has no other freedom. That liberty is not inconsistent with the necessity which springs from the constitution of our nature, but only with outward compulsion, has been demonstrated by the greatest thinkers of the church, Augustine, Calvin, Edwards. What liberty does he enjoy in whose heart the conflict is raging which Paul has depicted with graphic strokes in Romans 7? We can only say that freedom extends to the point of moral accountability. We are so far free that we are responsible. Because good and evil are united in our nature—so far as we know, in ours alone—we are capable in some degree of choosing between them. Because evil predominates, it is certain that evil will be our final choice, if we are left to ourselves. The will follows the nature.

"He needs only reflect on his own experience to be convinced that the man makes the motive, and not the motive the man. What is a strong motive to one man, is no motive at all to another. If then the man determines the motive, what determines the man—to a good and worthy act, we will say, or a virtuous course of conduct? The intelligent will, or the self-determining

power? True, in part it is; and therefore the will is preeminently the spiritual constituent in our being. But will any reflecting man admit that his own will is the only and sufficient determinant of all he is, and all he does? Is nothing to be attributed to the harmony of the system to which he belongs, and to the preestablished fitness of the objects and agents, known and unknown, that surround him, as acting on the will, though doubtless with it likewise? A process which the co-instantaneous, yet reciprocal action of the air and the vital energy of the lungs in breathing may help to render intelligible" (*Coleridge, Aids to Reflection—Moral and Religious Aphorisms*, 6).

The sovereignty of God and the freedom of man are set side by side in Scripture, taught with equal clearness. "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him"—"Ye will not come." Predestination must not be pressed to the point of fatalism; for fatalism is as foreign to the Scripture as Pelagianism. The responsibility for sin is thrown upon the sinner. God is sovereign, man is free. Beneath the divine decree is room for the play of human liberty, as there is room for all the world's activity beneath the over-arching heavens. We can only state, we cannot pretend to solve the mystery. How far God submits to limitation in conferring upon men the power of freedom we-

cannot tell. See the discussion of 1 Timothy 2: 4 in Thos. Aquinas, I. 19, 6. He teaches that abstractly God wishes all to be saved, as men, but not under actual conditions, as sinners. Absolutely considered, it is good that a man live, and evil that he be put to death. But if a man be a homicide, or his life is perilous to the public interest, it is well that he die, and wrong that he live. Whence it may be said that a just judge antecedently wishes that every man live; but consequently wishes that the homicide be hanged. So God antecedently wishes all men to be saved, but consequently wishes that some be condemned as justice requires. (See also John of Damascus, *Orthodox Faith*, ii. 29.) We can only say, God's purpose respects man's freedom, man's freedom fulfils God's purpose. Salvation is a gift, but we must work it out (Phil. 2: 12). The calling is of God, but we must walk worthy of it (Eph. 4: 1), and make it sure (2 Peter 1: 10).

It is plain, however, that the initiative in salvation belongs to God, and that the ultimate ground of it lies in His good pleasure.

2. The atonement of the Son. He came to reveal God for the redemption of man. That revelation is completed, that redemption is accomplished, by His death. As the Father gives the Son, the Son gives Himself (6: 51; 10: 18). From the beginning He foreknew and

foretold His death (2: 19), which indeed was predicted and prefigured in the Old Testament (Is. 53).

Nowhere in John, as in Matthew 20: 28, Mark 10: 45, is He said to die *instead of* ( $\alpha\pi\tau i$ ), but always *for* ( $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$ ) men, that is, for their sake, or advantage (Winer, *N. T. Grammar*, p. 383, note 2, and Ellicott on Gal. 3: 13); and His death is commonly represented as a sacrifice with no indication of the precise method in which it avails on our behalf. He must be lifted up (3: 14; 8: 28; 12: 32). In 10: 11, 15—"I lay down my life for the sheep," neither the figure nor the force of the term requires any more definite sense than *in behalf of*. Peter declared his readiness to lay down his life for his Master (13: 38), and John says that as He laid down His life for us, we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren (1 John 3: 16). The same thought is conveyed in 15: 13, "that a man lay down his life for his friends"; and is presented in the most general way in the figure of the grain of wheat that must die before it can bring forth fruit (12: 24). In 17: 19—"For their sakes I sanctify myself"—His death is included as the consummation of a lifelong sacrifice. His body was broken, His blood was shed for the life of the world (6: 51).

Usually therefore His death is said to avail for men in a sense which is not precisely defined.

There are two passages, however, in which His death is clearly represented as an expiatory sacrifice.

The first is the witness of John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (1: 29). The reference is unmistakably to Is. 53. The redemption there ascribed to the servant of Jehovah is typified by the paschal lamb, which was at once a historic memorial and a prophetic symbol, so that both the prediction of the prophet and the type of the law may be included in the term. His purity, patience, expiatory sufferings and death are all represented in the figure. Christ accomplishes what was foretold of the suffering servant and symbolized by the paschal lamb. Therefore the words of the law regarding the lamb—"A bone of him shall not be broken"—may be applied to Christ (19: 36). This is better than the reference to Ps. 34: 20, where it is said of the righteous, "He keepeth all his bones; not one of them is broken," because it preserves the figure. Whether δαίρων be rendered *bears* or *takes away* is of little importance, because a lamb can take away sin only by bearing it as a sacrifice, and because the meaning of the prophecy from which the figure is drawn is clear. Christ takes away sin by bearing it as the sacrificial lamb of God. "He was manifested to take away—or bear, ἀφῆι,—sins" (1 John 3: 5). The present *daírw* indicates the enduring effect of His sacrifice. "He is the pro-

pitiation" (1 John 2:2). The sacrifice was offered once for all, but it avails forever.

The second passage is contained in chapter 6. The people clamored for a sign, and challenged Jesus to work a miracle like the gift of manna in the wilderness. He did not remind them of the feeding of the five thousand which they had just witnessed, but turned their thoughts to spiritual truth. "I am the bread of life"—meat not perishable but enduring, not for the body but for the soul. And as they murmured, he proceeded to develop the truth. I am the bread, I give my flesh for the life of the world. And as they murmured again, he carried the thought still further, and showed them how men may partake of this bread from heaven. Thus He treated first the fact, I am the bread; then the gift, my flesh for the life of the world; then the appropriation of it, eating and drinking. The future, *I will* give, and the change in the phrase, no longer *myself* but *my flesh and blood*, point to His death; and how could His death avail for all mankind except as an expiatory sacrifice? His teaching, His life, avail for men only through His death, for through His death alone is atonement made for sin. The benefits of His sacrifice are appropriated by eating and drinking, that is, by believing. "Believe and thou hast eaten" (Augustine). To eat and drink is to believe, to believe is to receive (1:12). "He that believeth hath

eternal life" (6: 47). "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life" (6: 54). Through His death His life becomes available for men. The flesh is given that the spirit may be appropriated (6: 63). Jesus offers Himself to God as a sacrifice for sin, offers Himself to man as the food of the soul. His death has therefore a twofold effect; it expiates sin, it makes His life available for men. The second thought is prominent in the passage, while the first is rather assumed.

There is no direct reference in this discourse to the Lord's Supper, but the truth is taught that underlies the sacrament and gives it efficacy. This will be treated more fully in the chapter on the Church.

His death is a sacrifice for the world (6: 33, 51); for Gentiles as for Jews (10: 16; 11: 51, 52; I John 2: 2). Yet it is true that He lays down His life for the sheep, those given Him of the Father, because for them alone His death avails (10: 11, 15, 26).

By His death He glorifies God (13: 31, 32); finishes the work given Him to do (17: 4); makes atonement for sin; breaks the power of Satan (12: 31); and draws all men to Himself (12: 32).

His death was a predestined, predicted, voluntary sacrifice for the redemption of men, sufficient for all, efficient for them that believe upon His name.

## 236 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

Men were rushing to perdition, and God threw the law across their path. They transgressed it, trampled it under foot, and went their way. Then He came Himself in the person of His Son, and said, You shall not go down to hell but over My dead body. And the world beat Him down and slew Him, and over His bleeding corpse goes marching on to death. And yet He whom the world has slain is the sacrifice for the sins of the world. Out of the world's crime issues the world's redemption. The sin of man and the grace of God reach their height on Calvary.

The Father gave the Son, the Son gave Himself, that men might have life. That life is begotten in them by the Holy Spirit.

3. The regeneration of the Spirit. The phrases *born, begotten, of God, children of God*, are frequent in John, but the only explicit teaching regarding the new birth is found in chapter 3. Jesus gives men the power, the right, to become the sons of God; but the new birth by which they actually become sons is the work of the Spirit. The doctrine of regeneration was not new. It is taught in the Old Testament (Ps. 51: 10; Ezek. 36: 26), and Nicodemus should have been familiar with it (3: 10). But it is presented with new clearness and power by Him "who abolished death, and brought life and incorruption to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1: 10); and the operation

of the Spirit is disclosed. Our Lord teaches the need of (*a*) A *second* birth. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."  $\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  may signify *again* or *from above*, but the context almost requires the former sense. See the discussion in Ezra Abbot's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 34, and add to the authorities there cited Chrysostom on Colossians 3: 5. (*b*) A *spiritual* birth. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. The children of the kingdom are born not of blood, the material elements of which the body is composed, as the plural  $\alpha\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu$  suggests (1: 13); nor of the will of the flesh, mere sensual passion; nor of the will of man, as in the desire for posterity; but of God. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." No distinction is drawn between *seeing* and *entering* the kingdom. To see is to enjoy. Compare the similar phrases *see life* (3: 36) and *see death* (Luke 2: 26). The flesh, the lower nature, no longer dominates the life, but the spirit, by creation akin to God, now renewed by the Holy Spirit. (*c*) A *divine* birth, through which we become partakers of the divine nature (2 Peter 1: 4). Only the children of the King inherit the kingdom. (*d*) A *sovereign* birth. As the wind bloweth where it listeth, the Spirit worketh where He will.

With the Spirit water is named—"born of water and the Spirit." The reference to baptism is too plain to be mistaken, though many attempts have been made to evade it. The natural sense of the words, which would suggest itself at once to Nicodemus, must not be forsaken unless some other meaning is clearly required by the course of the narrative or by the general character of New Testament teaching. If, then, water signifies baptism, in what sense are men born of water and the Spirit?

To regard baptism as the sign of admission to the visible kingdom, while through the Spirit men enter the invisible kingdom, is to step beyond the line of thought in the chapter, which like the Gospel generally moves in the purely inward and spiritual sphere. The thought lies deeper. Baptism is the sign and seal of repentance and the forgiveness of sins. The ordinance is not essential to regeneration, but that which it represents is essential. The symbol is put for the fact. The old man dies in baptism, the new man is born of the Spirit. The primary reference of the words is probably to the baptism of John, though whether that or Christian baptism is meant is not important, for the significance of the rite is virtually the same. John preached "the baptism of repentance"; "repent and be baptized," said Peter, "unto the remission of your sins." And here, too, observe that baptism

is associated with the work of the Spirit. "Repent and be baptized . . . and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2: 38). The words mean then, unless men repent and are renewed by the Spirit, they cannot see the kingdom of God.

The same thought is presented in Titus 3: 5—"He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit" (compare Eph. 5: 26—"Having cleansed it [the church] by the washing of water with the word"). In all these instances the reference to baptism is too obvious to be disregarded. Yet nowhere is it taught that baptism is essential to salvation. The representation is parallel to that of Romans 10: 9—If thou shalt confess and believe, thou shalt be saved; and of Mark 16: 16, an early addition to the Gospel—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." In the following verses the work of the Spirit alone is referred to, as the greater includes the less. The sacraments are among the outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicates to men the benefits of His redemption; but neither in nature nor in grace is God confined to the use of means. The Spirit is as free as the air.

Regeneration does not confer new faculties upon men. They do not receive one endowment in the natural and another in the spiritual birth.

But the powers of the soul are purified and strengthened and turned in a new direction. The nature is renewed in every part, mind and heart and conscience and will. The soul is in substance the same, but it is cleansed from sin, and given new purpose and power. As the whole man was made in the image of God, so the whole man is renewed in the image of God. Every part of our nature was infected and defiled by sin, every part of our nature is cleansed and quickened by the Spirit.

Thus believers are chosen by the Father, redeemed by the Son, regenerated by the Spirit.

(B) The part of man. Thus far man might appear to be wholly passive in the hands of God. He has no power of himself to turn to God, to make atonement for sin, to renew his soul. And indeed in regeneration he is wholly passive. But he has his part in the work of salvation. That part in a word is termed conversion, turning about. Though the imparting of the new life is the work of the Spirit alone, yet man is active in the conditions which precede, accompany, and follow.

In a broad sense there may be many conversions in a man's life. He is converted, turned about, every time he comes back to God after he has fallen into sin. "When thou art converted," said Christ to Peter—when thou hast turned again—"strengthen thy brethren" (Luke 22:32).

But ordinarily the term is restricted to that initial act of turning from sin to God which determines the after life. Conversion may include the whole complex process of salvation, or it may be used with greater precision, in distinction from regeneration, to express the part of man in that process. Side by side with the work of God in salvation is set the work of man. “*Work . . . for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you*” (6:27).

The salvation provided and proffered by God is appropriated by man through knowledge, repentance, and faith.

(a) Knowledge. John magnifies the importance of knowledge beyond any other writer of the New Testament. “This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ” (17:3). Here we must observe the distinction between *εἰδέναι*, to know directly and intuitively, and *γνῶσκειν*, to come to know by experience.<sup>1</sup> It is not always observed by John, and at times the words are used almost interchangeably. Yet the distinction is real, and when men are said to know God *γνῶσκειν* is always used, never *εἰδέναι*. The knowledge of Him they have by nature is not saving knowledge. “The world by wisdom knew not God” (1 Cor. 1:21)—

<sup>1</sup> See Lightfoot on Galatians 4:9. Westcott on John 2:24.

neither the Father (17: 25), the Son, nor the Spirit (14: 17). Men must come to know Him through Jesus Christ. Jesus may use either term to express His knowledge of God, *οἶδα* (8: 55), *γνώσκω* (17: 25), since to Him belongs alike the knowledge of intuition and of experience. *γνώσκειν* is never used of mere intellectual knowledge of God by John, as it is by Paul (Rom. 1: 21). It denotes always the knowledge of sympathy and experience. *To know* is *to be in fellowship with*. It has therefore never an unfavorable sense, as it has in Paul (1 Cor. 8: 1, 2; 13: 2, 8). In his First Epistle John represents the conditions of this knowledge as obedience—"hereby know we that we know him, if we keep his commandments" (2: 3); righteousness—"whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him" (3: 6); and love—"every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God" (4: 7). "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself" (7: 17). Thus it may be said that to know Him is eternal life, because, as He is the fountain of life, to know Him is to appropriate the life that is in Him. The Jews believed that in the Word they should have eternal life, because through the Word is the knowledge of God. They failed to find life, not because they sought it in the Scriptures, but because they would not follow whither

the Scriptures led. "They testify of me," and "ye will not come to me" (5: 39, 40). The Word is not the remedy, but the prescription. The Scripture proffers life through Him. To know God is to love Him, and to love Him is to be made like Him. Paul contrasts knowledge and love, John regards them as inseparable; for with him knowledge is never of the intellect alone, but is sympathetic and vital, the appropriation of truth by mind and heart and will. So close and tender is the intimacy of Christ and His people that it is compared to the intimacy of the Father and the Son—"I am the good shepherd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father" (10: 14, 15).

(b) Repentance. The terms *repent*, *repentance*—*μετανοέω*, *μετανοία*, *μεταμέλομαι*, are not found in the Gospel or Epistles of John, though *μετανοέω* often occurs in the Apocalypse. Repentance is therefore nowhere expressly named as a condition of salvation; yet as we have seen it is implied in the phrase "*born of water*"; and is involved in the contrast drawn between the attitude of men toward sin before and after conversion. Christ is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (1: 29). "Every one that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin"—"the truth shall make you free" (8: 32, 34). Believers are not of the world. The putting away of sin in which repentance

essentially consists is constantly enjoined. "Sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee" (5:14; 1 John 3:5-10). While the word *repentance* then is not found, the thought is everywhere present, for it is involved in the transition from sin to holiness; but the emphasis is laid so strongly upon faith in the Gospel and upon love in the First Epistle that *repentance* is not named.

(c) *Faith*. See Art. *Faith* in Hastings' B. D. and literature there cited.

The conception of John as the apostle of love is drawn mainly from his Epistles. Throughout the Gospel faith is decidedly more prominent. The work of God is faith (6:29), the purpose of the Gospel is to beget faith (20:31), the historical development of the Gospel lies in the unfolding of faith and unbelief.

An examination of John's use of the terms *love* and *faith* is interesting and instructive, especially when compared with the usage of Paul. *πιστής* is not found in the Gospel, and in the other writings of John it occurs only five times: in his First Epistle 5:4, and in Revelation 2:13, 19; 13:10; 14:12. Elsewhere in the New Testament it is often found. But *πιστεύω* occurs ninety-nine times in the Gospel, nine times in the Epistles, and nowhere in the Revelation—a total of 108 times. In the other Gospels it is found in thirty-four instances; in the Epistles of Paul, fifty-five; in the Acts, thirty-seven; in Hebrews,

two ; in James, three ; in Peter, three ; in Jude, one —a total of 135 in the whole New Testament apart from the writings of John. *πίστις* occurs 142 times in Paul's Epistles (Hebrews not included), and *πιστεύω* fifty-five—a total in Paul's writings of 197 times. As in the Greek text of Westcott and Hort the Gospel of John occupies fifty-three pages and the Epistles of Paul 126 pages, it appears that *πιστεύω* is proportionately rather more frequent in the Fourth Gospel than *πίστις* and *πιστεύω* combined in the writings of Paul. On the other hand *ἀγάπη* is found seven times in the Gospel, *ἀγαπάω* thirty-seven, *φιλέω* thirteen—a total of fifty-seven; in Paul's Epistles *ἀγάπη* seventy-three, *ἀγαπάω* thirty-four, *φιλέω* two—a total of 109, a proportion nearly the same as in the former case. And it will be noted that, while *πιστεύω* is found ninety-nine times in the Gospel, the various words for love occur only fifty-seven times. Obviously the emphasis of the Gospel is rather upon faith than upon love. The proportion is very different in the Epistles. There we find *πίστις* once and *πιστεύω* nine times, a total of ten times; while *ἀγάπη* occurs twenty-one times and *ἀγαπάω* thirty-one—a total of fifty-two times. *φιλέω* and *φιλία* are not found in the Epistles. The love that springs in the heart of man is traced to the love of God: "We love, because he first loved us" (I John 4:19).

Jesus discoursed of love to His disciples in

## 246 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

chapters 14-16, and John treats of love in his letters to the church. But to the world the message is repent, believe. Love is the fruit of faith, not the condition but the effect of salvation. Knowledge and faith are inseparable in John, and sometimes one and sometimes the other precedes. Faith is put first in 6:69;—*Crede ut intelligas*—believe that thou mayest understand—(Augustine); knowledge in 10:38; 17:8; 1 John 4:16.

To believe means ordinarily to accept as true. Yet sometimes it is used of saving faith (5:24; 6:47; 8:24; 1 John 3:23). The initial act of faith is placed for the whole. On the other hand saving faith is commonly to *believe in* or *on*; yet sometimes these phrases denote a faith which is superficial and transient, mere assent to the truth (2:23, 24; 7:31). The distinction is plainly drawn in 8:31, 45, “Jesus said to those Jews which had believed him . . . because I say the truth ye believe me not.” They did not believe Him so as to accept all that He said; they simply believed Him in saying certain things. Evidently the Gospel recognizes different kinds and degrees of faith. Yet in general the distinction obtains that saving faith is believing *in* or *on*, denoting resting on and union with. The *name*—*δνομα*, from the root of *γνώσκω*, is that by which one is known. To believe on His name (1:12) is to believe on Him as He is made known. It is an evidence of John’s profounder

apprehension of the nature of faith that the phrase *to believe on*, which he often employs, is found, apart from the mockery of the Jews in Matt. 27:42, once only in the earlier Gospels (Matt. 18:6). Salvation proceeds not from believing Christ, but from believing on Him; entering into personal union with Him. Faith in Christ is counted for righteousness because it is the promise and potency of righteousness, uniting us to Him in whom we shall be made righteous.

According to the old derivation, spiritually if not etymologically correct, *believe* is *by-live*. A man's faith is that by which he lives.

Saving faith in Jesus involves therefore (*a*) the recognition of the truth of His claims. For this sufficient testimony is given. He appeals to seven witnesses—John the Baptist (5:33–35); His own works (5:36; 10:25); His Father (5:37; 8:18); the Scripture (5:39); Himself (8:18); the Holy Spirit (15:26); His disciples (15:27). (*b*) Trust, self-surrender. Recognize Him, then yield to Him. Faith has thus two parts—belief, the faith of the mind, and trust, the faith of the heart. Grace is the hand that God reaches down from heaven, faith the hand that man reaches up from earth. Faith lays hold of God; but what is far more important, it gives God something to lay hold of. It is not our laying hold of God that assures our safety, but His laying hold of us. Salvation does not hang

upon the feebleness of faith, but upon the might of grace. Grace provides salvation, faith accepts it. The value of faith lies not in its inherent worth or energy, but in its object. Feeble faith may lay hold upon a strong Savior. Salvation is a gift; faith receives it. Grace is the hand that gives, faith the hand that takes.

Sin is of man, with God's permission; salvation is of God, with man's consent.

The teaching of John throughout the Gospel is utterly hostile to the position of Ritschl, cited and approved by Sanday and Headlam (*Commentary on Romans*, p. 122) that "the proper object of justification" is "the Christian Society, as a collective whole, and not the individual as such." The individualism characteristic of the New Testament, and consequently of modern as distinguished from ancient civilization, reaches its height in John. Even under the old covenant it was only the outward and official relation of men to God that was mediated through the church; the inner life was one of immediate fellowship with Him, as the prophets and the Psalms bear witness. From the beginning men were saved not because they were of the *family* but because they were of the *faith* of Abraham. Under the new covenant men are related to God through Christ alone, and their relation to the church is determined by their relation to Him. That ordinarily men come to the knowledge of

Christ through the church of course is true; but they are not united to Christ through the church, but to the church through Christ. Organizations, institutions, sacraments, do not *constitute*, they only *manifest* the unity of believers, the unity which they have in Him. There is nothing between the vine and the branches.

Weiss has shown that Ritschl's position is also entirely at variance with Paul's doctrine. "According to Genesis 15 : 6, Abraham believed, and this faith of his was reckoned unto him for righteousness (Gal. 3 : 6; Rom. 4 : 3). Further, this typical parallel already shows plainly that it is not the church (Ritschl, II, p. 160, 214) but the individual that Paul thinks of as the object of justification, which Ritschl seeks in vain to dispute in opposition to the clear  $\delta\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\nu\tau\delta\nu\epsilon\kappa\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  of 3 : 26. So certainly as the saving effect of the death of Christ is throughout made to refer to the world as a whole, or at least to the totality of believers, so certainly is justification the individual appropriation of this saving effect, an appropriation which depends upon the subjective condition of faith" (*Bib. Theol. N. T.*, § 82 b).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> With this compare the remark of Prof. Bigg, that "a strictly Pauline church would, in the details of worship and discipline, approximate very closely to the ideal of the Puritans. It would be built upon the theory of direct and personal inspiration, not that of indirect and corporate inspiration" (*Intern. Comm. on Peter and Jude*, p. vii).

It is difficult indeed to conceive in what sense the church can be regarded as the object of justification except as an organized society. In that case all who are embraced within the organization are heirs of salvation, which is Judaism revived in its most unscriptural form. To say that the object of justification is "an ideal entity," as the church is represented to be in the passage quoted from Sanday and Headlam, conveys no meaning. The sacrifice offered for the world is appropriated by the individual, and the office of the church is simply to make it known.

There are two ways by which men seek to enter into life—the way of justice and the way of mercy. There are those who would earn heaven by self-righteousness and good works. He that fulfils the law has no need of grace; heaven is his of right. But the law requires perfect obedience. A single sin puts men outside the pale of the law, and incurs its condemnation. Christ is the divine standard, and he who would reach heaven by the way of justice must show a life as perfect as His.

"In the course of justice,  
None of us should see salvation; we do pray for mercy."

The way of justice is the way of death; the way of mercy is the way of life. Justice is the wall around the city, mercy is the open gate. The Pharisee prayed, God be just to me the righteous; the publican prayed, God be merciful

to me the sinner, and “ went down to his house justified rather than the other ” (Luke 18 : 10-14).

Thus we may speak of a twofold probation of mankind : (a) Collectively, in Adam, to determine whether they would continue in holiness. (b) Individually, in Christ, to determine whether they will continue in sin. Then probation was temptation, now it is opportunity. When man was holy, Satan tempted him to sin ; now that he is sinful, God invites him to holiness.

John is the only one of the evangelists who makes no allusion of any kind to children. The case of those who die in infancy, therefore, lies beyond our province. Yet the subject is of such interest that a reference to it may hardly be omitted. We may believe that as they all fell in Adam so they are all redeemed in Christ. Since Christ died for all, all are included within the benefits of the covenant of grace whom the Scripture does not expressly except. Our hope of their salvation rests wholly upon the sovereign grace of God, exercised through the Holy Spirit, who is not tied to means and ordinances, but works according to His own good pleasure. They who are capable of penitence and faith must repent and believe, and are saved by grace through faith ; they who are not capable are saved by grace alone.

The case of the heathen is considered in chapter II.

## IX

### THE NEW LIFE

THE new life, begun in Christ, is continued in Him. "Because I live, ye shall live also" (14: 19). If we read with the margin of the Revised Version, "Ye behold me: because I live, and ye shall live," the fact remains that the power to see Him lies in the possession of the same life. The truth is presented in many forms. All that men need is found in Him—the water of life (chapter 4); the bread of life (chapter 6); the light (1: 4; 8: 12; 9: 5; 12: 36, 46). He is the way and the truth and the life (14: 6), in Augustine's fine phrase, *quo itur Deus, qua itur homo*—as He is God He is the goal, as He is man He is the way; the resurrection and the life (11: 25). Every variety of figure is employed to illustrate His relation to the believer as the source and spring and strength and way and end of the new life.

His relation to the believer therefore is not one of simple fellowship. He is a friend, and He has given the highest proofs of friendship—sympathy, confidence, and sacrifice. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my

friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you" (15: 13-15). Father, Son, and Spirit dwell with the believer. "He (the Spirit) abideth with you" (14: 17). "My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (14: 23). God abides with the believer here, that the believer may abide with Him hereafter.

But Jesus not only abides *with*, He abides *within* the believer. There is a mutual abiding. He abides in the believer, and the believer in Him. "We abide in Him when we are His members; He abides in us when we are His temple" (Augustine, *Tract. on John* 27: 6). "Abide in me, and I in you"—see that ye abide in me, and I in you. This mystical union, this oneness of life which the believer has with Christ, is the heart and soul of the Gospel, and the emphasis laid upon it is one of the characteristic marks of distinction between John and the earlier evangelists. They present Him as the friend and Savior, John presents Him as the *life*, of men. In the Old Testament this representation of God dwelling in men is not found, though there are hints and suggestions of it. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name

is Holy : I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit" (Is. 57: 15). There God is said to abide *with* men, in the New Testament *within* men. Then tabernacle and temple symbolized His dwelling among men, now man himself is the sanctuary. According to the teaching of the New Testament every believer is a temple of God ; and again a larger view is taken, and all believers constitute one temple, in which each of them is a living stone. God dwells in the church only as He dwells in the individual heart. " Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you ? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy ; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are " (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17). " Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, which is in you, which ye have from God ? " (1 Cor. 6: 19). " In whom (Christ) each several building, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord ; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit " (Eph. 2: 21, 22). " Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house " (1 Peter 2: 5).

The figure does not occur in the Gospel in either sense, though it is suggested by the words of our Lord, that men shall not worship in Gerizim or in Jerusalem, but in spirit and truth.

The soul of man is the sanctuary of God, the holy place of the earthly temple. The phrase *to abide in* is not found in the earlier Gospels, and *to abide in a person* occurs in the New Testament only in John. Paul speaks of abiding in faith and love and holiness (1 Tim. 2: 15), in the things learned (2 Tim. 3: 14); and though the term *abide in Christ* is not found in his Epistles, the thought is familiar (Rom. 8: 10; Gal. 2: 20; Eph. 3: 17; Phil. 1: 21; Col. 1: 27; 3: 3, 4). Jesus speaks of abiding in His word (8: 31), and in His love (15: 9, 10. Compare Jude 21—"Keep yourselves in the love of God"); and of the word abiding in men (5: 38. Compare 8: 37—"My word hath not free course in you," where the margin of the Revised Version reads, "hath no place in you"). But the all comprehensive thought is, *abide in me*. To abide in Him is to be partaker of His life. The Spirit too, abides in men (14: 17), but this is not said directly of the Father, though the Son abides in men, and the Father in the Son (17: 23). In the First Epistle this abiding in men is ascribed expressly to the Father. "God is love; and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him" (1 John 4: 16. Comp. 4: 13). Father, Son, and Spirit make their home in human hearts.

The union of Christ and the believer is illustrated by three familiar figures.

## 256 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

(a) The shepherd and the sheep (chapter 10). In contrast with the Pharisees, who cast out the blind man that had been healed (chapter 9), Jesus calls Himself the good shepherd. The sheep, most defenseless and helpless of creatures, are entirely dependent upon the shepherd's care. Through him they enjoy safety, freedom, food—"By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and go out, and shall find pasture" (10:9). He cares for the sheep, loves them, defends them with His life, and the sheep know and love and follow Him. And to mark their dependence upon Him as yet more absolute, He is not only the shepherd, but the door, through which alone they may enter the fold.

(b) The bread of life (chapter 6). Eternal life is clothed in flesh and blood that it may be brought within reach of men. We have already seen that in this discourse He plainly refers to His sacrificial death. But the main point urged is that through death His life becomes available for men. By His death sin is expiated, and the way to God is opened. Thus in death His life is offered to men to be appropriated and assimilated as the food of the soul. That is to partake of the benefits of His atoning sacrifice, and to be made one with Him. His life must be continually appropriated by faith. The soul as well as the body has need of daily food, and we are taught to pray for forgiveness as often as we pray for

bread. As bread to the body, so is He to the spirit. He alone can give, He alone can sustain, the life of the soul. He is the source of all blessing, for men have salvation through His sacrifice, and sanctification through His Spirit. Because He is the living bread, he that eateth of Him shall live forever.

(c) The vine and the branches (chapter 15). He is the *true* vine in distinction from Israel, the degenerate vine, that bore only wild grapes (Is. 5). Men are vitally united to God through Him, as they were outwardly and formally united to God through the Old Testament church. This expresses the most intimate union possible. The relation of the shepherd and the sheep, however close and tender, is external. Food, though necessary, is foreign to the body. In each case the relation is extrinsic; though needful is not essential, not part of the life. The shepherd and the sheep are not one, nor are the body and the food. But the branches have not, have never had, life apart from the vine. The vine gave them birth, and they share and have always shared its life.

To give the highest possible expression to the oneness of the believer with Christ, figures drawn from earth are forsaken, and it is compared to the oneness of the Son with the Father. "That they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us . . . .

## 258 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one" (17: 21-23). The union of believers with one another is the fruit of their union with Him. They are all one because they are all in Him.

The new life in Christ is sustained by fellowship with Him through *faith* and *prayer*.

As the initial appropriation of Christ is by faith, so is continuous fellowship with Him. The faith that has once laid hold of Christ must cling to Him forever. Faith keeps the soul open towards God, is the surrender of the soul to Him that He may accomplish in it all His good pleasure. Faith is the channel through which grace enters the life. Christ dwells in the heart through faith (Eph. 3: 17). It is the condition of His abiding. To believe in Him is to be partaker of His life. We are justified through the *act* of faith, we are sanctified through the *work* of faith; for faith is the condition of the forgiveness of our sins and of the renewing of our souls.

Regarding the nature and efficacy of prayer, Jesus taught His disciples in His last discourse, (chapters 14-16.) Nowhere in John does He speak of prayer to unbelievers. Faith is the condition of prevailing prayer, and the first duty of the world is to believe. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him" (Heb. 11: 6).

Prayer is the soul's converse with God. It includes not petition only, but adoration, confession, and thanksgiving; and is commended by the teaching and the example of Christ. His example has already been considered (chapter 4). His instruction to His disciples regarding prayer is full and clear.<sup>1</sup> It must be offered *in my name* (14:13, 14; 15:16; 16:24, 26), a phrase which carries us back to the earliest record of worship in the Scripture—"Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. 4:26). *In my name* means, *in virtue of your relation to me*. Similar is the use of the term in 15:21—"All these things will they do unto you *for my name's sake*," because you are mine. The attitude of God and of the world towards the believer is determined by his relation to Christ. God loves him, the world hates him, because he is in Christ. Christ is the sphere of his life, and to pray in the name of Christ is to pray according to His will and for His glory. "If ye abide in

<sup>1</sup> The distinction between *alτεῖν* and *ἐρωτᾶν* is not easily drawn, and is of no great importance. Trench's distinction is certainly not correct, that "*alτέω*, the Latin *peto*, is more submissive and suppliant, indeed the constant word for the seeking of the inferior from the superior; . . . *ἐρωτάω* on the other hand is the Latin *rogo* . . . it implies that he who asks stands on a certain footing of equality with him from whom the boon is asked" (*N. T. Syn.*, § 40). The matter is treated in Thayer's *Lexicon*, under *alτέω*, and in Stevens' *Johannine Theology*, chapter 12.

me, and my words abide in you" (15:7), is in substance an amplification of the phrase, "*in my name.*"

If this condition be fulfilled, prayer will be answered. It is answered as it is offered in the name of Christ, for His sake. Through Him man draws near to God in prayer, through Him God draws near to man in blessing. The answer is from the Father (15:16; 16:23, 24, 26), and the Son (14:13, 14), and is given, as the prayer is offered, that the Father may be glorified in the Son (14:13). Every prayer is answered in so far as it is according to the will and for the glory of God. Prayer is not the substitution of man's will for God's, but the submission of man's will to God's. It is not possible that every petition should be granted, for the prayers of men are as conflicting as their interests and desires. To pray is not to usurp the throne, but to bow before it; else the prayer would be virtually a command, and the reins of government would be transferred from the Creator to the creature. This gives us freedom in prayer. If God promised unconditionally to grant every petition, we should be afraid to pray. We know not what to pray for as we ought, and our prayer might prove our ruin. But we may ask what we will because we know that divine wisdom will overrule our ignorance. The goodness of God is shown as truly in denying as in granting our de-

sires. The prayer may be answered when the petition is refused. Paul prayed to be delivered from the thorn in the flesh, not so much because of the pain it caused him, as because he conceived it to be a hindrance to his ministry. He said, It keeps me weak; God said, It makes you strong. It is the condition of spiritual power. He said, I should do my work better if I were rid of it; God said, It is the thorn that makes you fit for the work. It does not hinder, it helps. Through the thorn grace is given you for sanctification and for service. It keeps you humble, it makes you strong. Then he was content. "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses, that the strength of Christ may rest upon me . . . for when I am weak, then am I strong" (2 Cor. 12: 9, 10)—weak in myself, strong in him. Christ prayed that the cup might pass from Him, yet "not my will, but thine, be done." The petition was denied, the prayer was answered. The burden of every petition offered in the name of Jesus is that God may be glorified. The answer never falls below the prayer. God will grant the petition, or, if that may not be, He will do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think. Every prayer is answered in the way that infinite love and wisdom determine to be best. The philosophical difficulties that beset the doctrine of prayer never dawned upon the simple faith of the early

disciples. For us the solution of them lies in the word *Father*. If God is Father, His children may be assured that He has not tied His hands so that they must cry unto Him in vain. The Father will suffer nothing to come between Him and His children. In the divine administration provision is made for prayer. It is one of the elements that enter into God's purpose, and has its place and part as truly as the forces that operate in the world of sense. The decree by which the universe is ordered is not a blind and arbitrary command; it takes all things into account, gathers within its ample scope all the powers of matter and of spirit, works out its vast designs through agencies unnumbered. And among the powers and agencies thus enlisted is prayer. The prayer of man serves a part in fulfilling the purpose of God. It does not enter as an alien power which cannot prevail without disturbing the course of nature; it is one of the forces by which that course is determined.

The characteristic features of the new life are *sanctification* and *service*. The teaching of John is in accord with that of James and Paul. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (Jas. 1:27). "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all

iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Titus 2: 14).

(a) Sanctification is the renewing of the whole man in the image of Christ, the unfolding of the life imparted in regeneration. As Christ dwells in the believer through faith, by His Spirit He fashions him anew after His own likeness.

The fundamental conception of holiness in Scripture usage is consecration, setting apart. It involves purification from sin, and growth in all the graces of the Christian life. Ideally the new life is a life free from sin, consecrated to God, devoted to the service of man. "For their sakes, I sanctify myself," said the Master, "that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth" (17: 19). That is, I offer Myself a sacrifice, that by My death they may receive sanctification through the Spirit. I consecrate My life in death, that their lives may be consecrated in truth. I die for them that they may live for Me. He both sanctifies Himself and is sanctified by the Father (10: 36). So is it with the believer. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling: for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2: 12, 13). "And every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself, even as he is pure" (1 John 3: 3). Believers are the sanctified, saints.

Jesus gives Himself *for* the believer in His

death ; then He gives Himself *to* the believer in His risen life. His church is " his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all " (Eph. 1 : 23). The fulness of the Godhead dwells in the Son, and He imparts Himself to His people. The church is the fulness of Christ, as Christ is the fulness of God. What does He withhold from His people ? Is it knowledge ? " All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known to you." Is it authority ? " As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." Is it power ? " Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also ; and greater works than these shall he do ; because I go unto the Father." Is it holiness ? " For their sakes I sanctify myself that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth." Is it peace ? " Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you : not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." Is it joy ? " These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full." Is it love ? " As the Father hath loved me, even so have I loved you." Is it glory ? " The glory which thou gavest me I have given them." He communicates His fulness to the church through its individual members. " Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." And the end is that we may

be complete, made full, in Him (Col. 2: 10), may be filled unto all the fulness of God (Eph. 3: 19), may come unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ (Eph. 4: 13).<sup>1</sup> "All things are yours" (1 Cor. 3: 21). He gives Himself as largely and as freely as men are able to receive. The believer is His, as the purchase of His blood and the temple of His Spirit. Paul delighted to term himself *the servant, the slave*, of Jesus Christ. In the same sentence Peter addresses believers as *free*, and as the *bond-servants of God* (1 Pet. 2: 16). In His service alone is perfect freedom, because there alone man enjoys the unfettered exercise of his powers, and may pursue the end for which he was created.

The graces of the Christian life are gradually appropriated and developed. This is strikingly illustrated in the experience of the first disciples. Throughout the Gospels their knowledge is represented as highly imperfect. Jesus spake to them in proverbs (16: 25), in such words and figures as were suited to their comprehension. "Many things have I to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now" (16: 12)—are able neither to understand nor to obey. They knew not the Scripture that He must rise again (2: 22; 20: 9), nor did they grasp the meaning of His own words. Their questions betray a lamentable

<sup>1</sup> On the word *fulness*, *πλήρωμα*, see the admirable note of Lightfoot, Col. 1: 19.

ignorance of the truth He sought to teach them. "I shall teach you plainly," He said (16: 25), a promise fulfilled through the Spirit (14: 26). Their faith was weak (2: 22; 16: 30, 31; 20: 8), and their love (14: 28). Though they were delivered from the guilt of sin, they were in need of constant purification. The body was bathed, but the feet must be washed (13: 10). The soul redeemed is in contact with a sinful world, and needs daily cleansing. "Forgive us our debts" is a prayer for every day. Sin is expiated once for all, but when the guilt is removed the pollution lingers. An old divine has truly said, "The believer is justified that sin may not condemn; sanctified, that sin may not reign; glorified, that sin may not be." These are the steps by which we climb to heaven.

This law of gradual sanctification throws light upon the apparent contradictions which meet us in the First Epistle of John. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. . . . If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (1: 8, 10). But again, "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God" (3: 9). "We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but he that was begotten of God keepeth him (Amer. Rev. *himself*), and the evil one toucheth

him not" (5:18). John appears entirely unconscious of the difficulty which has perplexed the minds of his readers for centuries, gives no explanation, makes no attempt to harmonize these conflicting statements. The Scripture often presents a paradox as if it were a platitude, sets apparently inconsistent affirmations side by side, and leaves us to reconcile them if we can. And it is often urged that the Word is at war with itself, and cannot therefore make good its claim of divine origin and authority.

The simple answer is, the Bible does not create these difficulties, it only recognizes them. They are in the Bible because they are in the world. Sir William Hamilton said, No difficulty emerges in theology which has not previously emerged in philosophy. We may say, No difficulty meets us in Scripture which does not meet us in life. To complain of the hard sayings of Scripture is to complain of the chart because it lays down the rocks and reefs. Every troublesome doctrine in Scripture was first a troublesome fact in life. It confronted men before a line of the Bible was written, it would confront them if the Bible were destroyed. You can no more get rid of these difficulties by closing the Bible than you can get rid of time by selling your watch. Scripture is full of perplexities and mysteries because Scripture is true to life, holds the mirror up to man and nature. Of what use is it to shut

sin and Satan out of our theology when we cannot shut them out of our life? What God says in the Bible He does in the world, and our quarrel is properly not with the Scripture, but with the facts of life and the course of providence.

The fundamental contradiction of the universe is sin. All the difficulties that perplex us spring from this single root. In the beginning unbroken harmony prevailed. Sin entered, an alien and hostile power. Now the universe is divided, and the kingdoms of good and evil wage perpetual war. The primal contradiction from which all others take their rise is the existence of sin under the government of a just and holy God.

Man too is divided against himself, for he is fallen under the power of sin. He is part flesh, kindred to the brute, part spirit, kindled by the breath of the Almighty; and the higher and the lower nature are at war. This conflict is heightened by grace. The Christian life is represented by the most discordant figures. It is a feast, rest, joy, peace; again it is self-denial, cross-bearing, a race, a battle. Both representations are true, for the believer leads a dual life. By nature he is in the world, by grace he is in Christ. In the world he has tribulation, in Christ he has peace (16: 33). So far as he is in the world he is sinful, so far as he is in Christ he is righteous. He leads at once the life of the

flesh and the life of the spirit; the life of holiness and the life of sin. Opposite qualities may therefore be ascribed to him. He is mortal, he is immortal. He is a sinner, he is a saint. He is a child of earth, he is a son of God. What is true of him on one side of his nature is not true of him on the other side. The conflict to which John alludes in general terms Paul depicts in Rom. 7, as it was waged in his own breast.

It is characteristic of John that he regards good and evil not so much in their present state of development as in their idea, tendency, issue. Ideally the believer is, ultimately he shall be, free from sin; and John presents the ideal as actual, and the certain future as present. He looks to the end from the beginning and treats that which is certain to be as already accomplished.

The believer then continues to sin, but sin is no longer related to his life as it was before. Then it was characteristic, dominant, vital; now it is accidental and occasional. It does not belong to the new life which is opening, but to the old life which is closing. The sins of the believer are the expiring struggles of the old man of sin. The dying nature is spoken of as dead. He may say therefore, "It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me;" for sin is no longer the master whom he serves but the enemy whom he fights. Sin still lingers in the lower

nature, but in the higher nature, the true self, he delights in the law of God. The soul lies open to the influences and is played upon by the forces of the unseen world. The lower nature is reinforced from beneath, the higher nature is strengthened from above. Sin is not the expression of my inmost life, said Paul, for it is not I that live, but Christ that liveth in me. It is an alien power, from which I have not wholly escaped, but to which I no longer consent as before. There is war between us, and I shall prevail at last.

This is in accord with the uniform teaching of Scripture that there are different kinds and degrees of sin. There is sin unto death, there is sin not unto death (1 John 5: 16, 17). *Sin*, the rendering of the margin of the Revised Version, is better than *a sin*, for it is disposition rather than action of which the apostle speaks, or rather disposition betrayed in action. Some sins are rather incidental than vital, spring from infirmity, the weakness of the flesh, rather than from settled and deliberate purpose of wrong-doing. The distinction is clearly drawn in the Old Testament between sins of this character and presumptuous sins. (See Delitzsch on Ps. 19: 13. Schultz, *O. T. Theol.* 2: 14, 2. Oehler, *O. T. Theol.* § 76. Beyschlag, *N. T. Theol.* Bk. 5: 3; ch. 5, § 6.) There are sins which lay hold upon the depths of the soul, and others which play rather upon the sur-

face of the life. The distinction lies not in the outward act, but in the purpose and the degree of deliberation with which it is performed. Sins that spring from ignorance, thoughtlessness, inexperience, do not evince a depraved heart like those which spring from a deliberate and stubborn choice of evil. *Sin unto death* is wilful, determined, presumptuous sin; and for it prayer is not enjoined, though it is not forbidden (1 John 5:16). The reference is to professed believers—"if any man see his *brother* sinning"—and the connection indicates that the specific sin referred to is apostasy from Christ (compare Heb. 6. See Calvin, *Instt.* III, 3:21ff.). By that sin the bond which unites believers is broken, and therefore he is no longer a brother as before, nor entitled to the prayers of the brethren. When he cuts himself off from Christ, by the same act he cuts himself off from the fellowship of believers, and no longer sustains to them that relation on which prayer is based. He has gone back to the world, and prayer for him as for the world is neither commanded nor forbidden. We shall consider presently the relation of the believer to unbelievers; this passage might seem to indicate that we *must* pray for the brethren, that we *may* pray for the world.

It must also be borne in mind that here, and always, the Scripture has a practical aim. The teaching of the Word must never be detached from life, isolated from experience, studied as it

were in a vacuum. John does not undertake to give a complete theological statement of the place of sin in the life of the believer. He seeks to guard his readers against certain errors which threatened them, as they threaten the believer in every age. He makes these different and apparently contradictory affirmations because each of them answers an immediate practical purpose. This double representation is suited to our double nature. On the one side by reminding us of indwelling sin he forbids us to believe that the work of sanctification is already complete. On the other side by assuring us that the power of sin is broken he forbids us to despair, or to excuse ourselves for our shortcomings with the plea that sin is natural to us. Grace is given to overcome nature. You cannot plead that you were born a sinner, for you were born again a saint. The fundamental law of the new life is holiness.

John then treats rather of the result than of the process of sanctification. He considers the initial act of faith as conditioning and determining the life throughout. "He that is born of God cannot sin" is ideally and ultimately though not actually and immediately true. He regards the goal rather than the stages by which it is attained. Yet the process is not wholly overlooked. Sanctification is referred to the Father, who accomplishes it by His providence in the discipline of life, as the husbandman who prunes the vine

(15:1), and through the truth (17:17). Usually sanctification is represented as effected through His word—"Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you" (15:3), for His words "are spirit and life" (6:63). In 1 John 1:7 the blood of Christ is represented as cleansing from all sin, because through His death we have the forgiveness of sins and the renewing of the Spirit. Compare Rev. 7:14—"These are they which come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Sanctification is nowhere in the Gospel referred directly to the Holy Spirit; but as men are sanctified in the truth, and it is His office to lead them into all the truth, sanctification is of Him. He is called the *Holy* Spirit, as we have seen, because He is the source of holiness in the creature; and that this is His office toward the disciples is the thought that underlies the parting words of Jesus. It was expedient for them that He should go away, because He would send the Spirit to accomplish in them the purpose of His death. The Son redeems, the Spirit regenerates and sanctifies. The origin and development of the new life are alike of Him.

(b) Service. The believer draws his life from Christ, he renders his life again to Christ in loving obedience. The life is of the vine, the branches bear the fruit. The vine bears fruit

through the branches. It is the outer life, the activity, that is signified by fruit. "Go and bear fruit" (15: 16) points to the *labors* of the apostles. *κάρπος* is used elsewhere in the Gospel only in 4: 36 and 12: 24, and signifies the fruit not of *character* but of *service*. Two kinds of branches are named, the fruitless and the fruitful. Both feel the knife. The fruitless are cut off to be burned, the fruitful are pruned to bear more fruit. The sole purpose of the vine is fruit. The wood is good for nothing (Ezek. 15). *Aut vitis aut ignis* (Augustine), the vine or the fire. The fruitless branches represent those who profess but do not perform, who "call me Lord, Lord, but do not the things that I say" (Luke 6: 46). Men may have faith without love (1 Cor. 13: 2) or without works (Jas. 2: 26), and in either case they are unfruitful. The fruitful branches are pruned. By this term the whole process of sanctification for service is denoted. All the discipline of life is directed to this end, that more fruit may be borne. He who suffers under the knife may rejoice that he is counted a fruitful branch. The branch is fruitful as it partakes of the life of the vine, for it has no life of its own. The distinction between fruitful and unfruitful is the distinction between abiding and not abiding (15: 5, 6). "Apart from me ye can do nothing." The fruitfulness of the believer proves him a disciple, and glorifies God (15: 8).

The service of the believer is rendered to the brethren and to the world.

✓ (a) To the brethren. The only sufficient motive of service is love. Love to the brethren is the essential mark of the believer, and it alone gives assurance of salvation. "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3: 14). Without it there is no love of God. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" (1 John 4: 20). It is the evidence of discipleship to the world—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" (13: 35), and it was the purpose of the last discourse to lead them to it (15: 17). Four objects Christ had in view in His closing words. "These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy may be in you, and that your joy may be fulfilled" (15: 11); "These things I command you, that ye may love one another" (15: 17); "These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be made to stumble" (16: 1. Compare verse 4); "These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye may have peace" (16: 33). Joy and love and stedfastness and peace were His parting gifts.

Love is the motive of service, service is the fruit of love. Without service love is barren

(1 John 3: 17), as service is barren without love (1 Cor. 13: 3). There is no true love without service, there is no worthy service without love. Service is the expression and the evidence of love. The mutual relation of believers one to another in love and service springs from their common relation to Him. All love indeed is traced to God as its source and spring. "We love because he first loved us" (1 John 4: 19). "If ye love me ye will keep my commandments" (14: 15); "This is my commandment, that ye love one another" (15: 12). We serve Him in serving His disciples. "If I then, the Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash"—not my feet, but—"one another's feet" (13: 14). "If ye love me, feed my sheep, my lambs" (21: 15-17). Love to Christ issues in obedience to Him and in service to His brethren. Love to man is one of the great commandments of the Old Testament on which hang all the law and the prophets, yet He pronounced it a new commandment. It is enacted with new motive, sanction, example, measure. His love is the motive and measure of ours. "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you" (15: 9). "This is my commandment that ye love one another, as I have loved you" (15: 12). There is no limit to the service and sacrifice of love. "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives"—not for him

but—"for the brethren" (1 John 3: 16). We must serve them as we would serve Him if He were here in person. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is the law of the old covenant; "love as I have loved you" is the law of the new. The law fulfilled objectively by Christ is fulfilled subjectively by love. "Love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13: 10). In other words, the law is fulfilled by Christ *for* the believer, then by Christ *in* the believer. His righteousness is first *imputed*, then *imparted*. He fulfilled the law for us, we fulfil the law in Him.

There are two distinct terms in the Greek to represent love, *φιλεῖν*, *φιλία*, and *ἀγαπᾶν*, *ἀγάπη*. It is obvious that the latter is the favorite term in the New Testament. *φιλεῖν* occurs twenty-five times, *ἀγαπᾶν* about one hundred and forty; *φιλία* once (Jas 4: 4), *ἀγάπη* about one hundred and sixteen. In the Septuagint the preponderance is yet greater. *ἀγαπᾶν* occurs about two hundred and sixty-eight times, *φιλεῖν* about twelve times, without counting the instances in which it signifies merely *to kiss*. (See Sanday and Headlam, *Comm. on Romans*, p. 374.)

It is further obvious that both verbs may be used in an unfavorable sense, of the love of evil, as *φιλεῖν* in Matt. 6: 5; 23: 6; Rev. 22: 15, and *ἀγαπᾶν* in Luke 11: 43; John 3: 19; 12: 43. But it is worthy of note that while *φιλία* in the single instance of its use bears an unfavorable

sense, ἀγάπη is always righteous love. The word is distinctively religious in its origin and usage; coined apparently by the Septuagint because the terms already current were defiled by sensual associations; and so far as appears used elsewhere before the New Testament by Philo alone (*deus immut.* § 14, frag. vol. 6, 204, ed. Richter). In the great passages which treat of love ἀγάπη is used—John 14–16; 1 Cor. 13; 1 John throughout.<sup>1</sup>

Obviously ἀγαπᾶν and ἀγάπη are the favored words. φιλεῖν is rather the love of instinct, of natural affection, ἀγαπᾶν of discriminating choice. Compare the distinction which Thomas Aquinas draws between the corresponding Latin terms—“Dilectio addit ad amorem electionem precedentem,” *dilectio* adds to *amor* a preceding choice (2: 26, 3).

Man is commanded therefore ἀγαπᾶν God but not φιλεῖν, though in 1 Cor. 16: 22 we read, “If any man loveth not the Lord (οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον), let him be anathema,” for the love enjoined is of the mind, heart, soul, strength. If God is altogether lovely, if all the qualities that invite love and gratitude are found in Him, it is not unreasonable that love to Him should be required, and where that love is not rendered it is evidence of an evil heart. He who does not love a good father is counted unnatural. He ought to love him because he is worthy of love; if he does

<sup>1</sup> See Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, p. 198.

not, he betrays the evil of his nature. Not to love the lovely is to evince an unloving spirit. We are to love God not with blind, unreasoning passion, but with that intelligent and discriminating choice which fixes upon Him as supremely worthy of all that we can render. And in this love every faculty of the soul may have its part, understanding, emotion, will.

Instances may be found in which the distinction is lost sight of or obscured, as must be the case in such delicate shadings of thought. But ordinarily it may be traced, and *ἀγαπᾶν* is the higher term. Yet it should not be said that it always implies respect. The love of God for the world is not based upon esteem. The subtle play of thought that underlies the change of words in 21:15-17 can be represented in English only by a paraphrase. Twice Jesus used the nobler term—Lovest thou me? Twice Peter in his humility answered with the lower. And the third time Jesus accepted the word of the disciple. Dost thou love me even thus? If even this lower love be thine, thou art forgiven and restored.

It has often been remarked that friendship, the virtue so highly prized in antiquity, and which fills so large a place in classic literature and in the Old Testament, is almost unknown to the New. The reason is plain. The believer can have no friendship with the world. The only

instance in which the word occurs is in Jas. 4:4, "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" The distinction is so broad and deep that while the believer may cherish towards the world pity and compassion, friendship is impossible, for it implies congeniality and esteem. And on the other side between believers friendship yields to love. Friendship is too strong a term to apply to the relation of the believer to the world, and too weak to apply to his relation to the brethren.

(b) To the world. Nowhere in the Gospel or Epistles of John is love to unbelievers enjoined, but always love to the brethren. Yet God loved the world, Christ died for the world, and the relation of the believer to the world is clearly defined. In chapters 14-17 Jesus refers to the world more than twenty times. The relation that the disciple sustains to Him on the one side and to the world on the other is the theme of His discourse and the burden of His prayer. Observe how the horizon widens as the prayer proceeds. He prayed for Himself, then for His disciples, then for the world. The prayer is as broad as the sacrifice. He prayed for His disciples—"not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me"—because they were nearest to Him, and because the sanctification of the disciples must precede the salvation of the world. But the world was not forgotten. How could it

be, when He was just about to die for the world? When John is named "the disciple whom Jesus loved," his fellow disciples are not excluded. That Jesus died for His friends (15:13, 14) does not forbid us to believe that He died for His enemies (Rom. 5:8, 10). In each case the distinction drawn is not absolute but relative. He prayed for the disciples for the sake of the church, He prayed for the church for the sake of the world.

The teaching of the Gospel regarding the relation of believers to the world may be summed up in three propositions.

(1) By nature believers are in the world. That is true not merely in a physical sense. They have their part of the world's work to do, are partners in the world's business. The disciple is a man before he is a disciple, and he does not cease to be a man in becoming a disciple. His domestic, social, civil relations remain unchanged. He is father, friend, neighbor, citizen, a member of the family of man. He does not leave the world when he enters the kingdom. His surroundings, relations, calling, are not altered by conversion. God wants Christian men everywhere, because He wants all the work of the world well done; and the believer is to abide in that calling wherein he was called, until God shall lead him to another place.

(2) By grace believers are called out of the world. They are called to be Jesus Christ's,

called to be saints. That word *called* pictures the origin, the nature, the destiny of the Christian life. Abraham was called of God, and Moses, and Israel. The disciples were called by Jesus. Every believer is called by the Spirit. No man taketh this honor on himself but he that is called of God. The church is the company of the called. We are called to holiness (1 Pet. 1 : 15), to peace (Col. 3 : 15), to liberty (Gal. 5 : 13), to the fellowship of our Lord (1 Cor. 1 : 9); and the end of our calling is eternal life (1 Tim. 6 : 12), "his own kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. 2 : 12). The believer still plays his part in the activity of the world, but not in the spirit of the world. The contrast is sharply drawn in several particulars. He loves God, the world hates God. Is that a harsh judgment? What did the world do with God when He came within reach? Crucified Him. The believer's Lord is Jesus; the prince of the world is Satan. When Jesus was betrayed, the world rejoiced, the disciples mourned. The Spirit is given to the believer, while the world cannot receive Him, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him. The believer is holy through the cleansing of the Word and the Spirit, while the world lieth in the evil one. The world is in Satan as the believer is in Christ. Peace is his of which the world knows nothing. Through faith he is clothed with power like his Master's. Love is lifted above the level of nat-

ural affection. Love your friends and hate your enemies, says the world ; love your neighbor as yourself, said the Old Testament ; love as I have loved you, said Jesus. Out of this world sinful and condemned God has chosen and called those who shall be to Him a peculiar people.

Because believers, like their Master, are not of the world, the world hates them as it hated Him. The world loves *its own*. This antagonism abides. Love of the world and of God cannot dwell together. "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John 2:15; Jas. 4:4). In so far as the church and the world are at peace, it is because each has tempered the other. The spirit of the world penetrates the church, the spirit of the church penetrates the world. The church has something of worldliness, and the world has something of religion. In proportion as each is true to its distinctive nature, they are and must ever be at war. In the case of the early disciples the enmity of the world assumed the form of persecution, now it ordinarily assumes the form of seduction. Consciously or unconsciously the power of the world is exerted to draw the children of God down to its own level.

The believer overcomes the world through faith (1 John 5:4, 5). The reference is to individual experience, not to the outward triumphs of Christianity. "I have overcome the world,"

said Jesus (16: 33), vanquished its king. The believer is united with Him through faith, and has part in His triumph. The victory He won for believers in His life of obedience and death of sacrifice He wins again in each individual believer. The soldier who follows the leader shares in the honor and reward. We contend against a foe whose power is broken, so that in Christ we are stronger than he.

(3) By grace believers are sent into the world.

The natural man is *born* into the world, the spiritual man is *sent* into the world. He is a conscious and voluntary agent of God's will. "As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world" (17: 18). Because the world lies in the wicked one, and its works are evil (7: 7), it must be saved by a power from without. Before men can have a part in saving the world, they must be separated from the world, for the spirit of the world is enmity to God. Christ calls men out of the world into a new sphere, a new life, renews, sanctifies, clothes them with power, and then sends them into the world again. The world is the scene and sphere of their service. "I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one"—the evil one in whose power the world lies (17: 15). The world needs the service of the believer, the believer

needs the discipline of the world. The world aids the believer, as the water aids the boat, when he pulls against it.

In the world by nature, by grace the believer is chosen out of the world, and then sent into the world on a mission of redemption.

The doctrine of the final perseverance of believers is beset with the same difficulties as the doctrine of election. One is the corollary of the other, and they stand or fall together. The crucial question is, which is the determining factor in salvation, the will of man or the will of God, grace or faith? Faith is the condition, but what is the ultimate ground of faith? Does it rest upon a divine choice? Is faith too the gift of God? The difficulty inheres in the cooperation of the human and the divine, the play of separate wills in the same life. There are portions of the Word which refer salvation to the good pleasure of God in the most absolute terms, there are other portions which throw the responsibility upon man. The Scripture represents believers as chosen of God from eternity, kept by divine grace, already in possession of eternal life, so united to Christ by faith that they are His forever. "They shall never perish," said Jesus, "and no one shall snatch them out of my hand." And then, as if those who heard Him might distrust His power, He added, "My Father, which hath given them unto me, is greater than all;

and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand" (10: 28, 29). Stronger assurance could not be conveyed in human speech. "They shall never perish," "no one shall snatch them out of my hand"—neither by inward decay nor outward violence shall they cease to be mine. Yet over against these words are set the most solemn and repeated warnings against the danger of falling away, and the perils and penalties of apostasy are painted in the most vivid colors.

We must confess that we cannot frame a scheme that will reduce these apparent discords to harmony. We are not sufficiently acquainted either with ourselves or with God to draw the line between His activity and ours in the work of salvation. If grace penetrates faith, and faith conditions grace, it is impossible for us to distinguish them with accuracy, or to determine the precise weight and potency of each in the unfolding of the spiritual life. But it must be said in general that the New Testament ascribes salvation ultimately to the free and sovereign will of God, which indeed is not arbitrary, but operates in a sphere so vast and upon interests so complex that the grounds of its working must often lie beyond our comprehension. God chooses and loves man before man can choose and love God. Faith is not the root but the fruit of grace, not the cause but the effect of God's free choice, and grace is the dominant and

controlling element in the new life. There is a point in every life when the decisive choice is made between good and evil, and he who once submits himself to God is His eternally. There is a divine election which secures the salvation of the believer. But this election does not supersede or annul his freedom, for it does not work independently of his will, but ensures the cooperation of his will by bringing to bear upon him the strongest motives that can actuate the soul. The warnings against falling are among the means by which God keeps him from falling. The very word *perseverance* indicates that the free agency of man is not impaired, for it expresses arduous and continued effort. We are enabled to work out our own salvation because it is God that worketh in us both to will and to work, for his good pleasure (Phil. 2: 13).

## X

### THE CHURCH

THE teaching of John regarding the church is almost entirely indirect and incidental, but it is not therefore to be disregarded; for his silence is often more significant than speech. It is always true indeed that speech must be weighed in the balance of silence; part of the truth remains unspoken. The argument from silence may be abused, but when it is properly employed no process of logic has more convincing power. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews lays great stress upon it in representing Christ as a priest after the order of Melchizedec, who was "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life" (Heb. 7: 3). The principle is illustrated in an article by Prof. Herrick Johnson, "The Silence of Scripture a Proof of its Divine Origin," in the *Presbyterian Review* for April, 1886. Calvin wields the argument with vigor in controverting the Roman Catholic doctrine of the constitution of the church (*Instt.* IV. 6).

Four themes require consideration—the Nature, the Organization, the Unity, and the Extension of the church. No explicit teaching is given

concerning them, but there are hints and suggestions and omissions which must not be overlooked if we would frame a complete conception of the church according to the New Testament pattern. Details are wanting, but the great principles that underlie and control the life of the church are indicated with sufficient clearness. It may be said indeed that nothing that is essential to the church is omitted, nothing that is incidental is included. And the very absence of the specific and the temporal may enable us more readily to apprehend the enduring principles on which the church is established. Dr. Hort goes so far as to say that chapters 13-17 of John's Gospel are "on the whole the weightiest and most pregnant body of teaching on the Ecclesia to be found anywhere in the Bible" (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 223). It is our present task then to gather, if we may, the several threads of John's teaching upon this subject, and weave them into their proper place in his system of doctrine—a task the more needful because in most expositions of his theology the church is wholly ignored, or, if it find a place at all, is treated with disappointing brevity and incompleteness.

1. *The Nature of the Church.*—See Hodge's *Church Polity*, especially ch. I—"The idea of the Church," and p. 205ff. As an eminently lucid, rational, and correct exposition of the teaching of the Scripture upon the subject, this volume may

be commended in the highest terms. I know of nothing more sound, sensible, and satisfactory. The true Scriptural position is stated and defended with masterly skill. See also Cunningham's *Historical Theology*, ch. 1, and Newman Smyth's *Christian Ethics*, p. 274.

The first chapter of the Gospel leads us to the fountainhead of the New Testament church, the tiny spring whence the mighty river took its rise.

It is characteristic of John, as we have frequent occasion to note, that he presents Christianity in its simplest form, its ultimate elements ; the substance divorced from the accidents, eternal truth apart from the temporal forms which it successively assumes. With the externals of religion he is not concerned. The word *church* is not found in the Gospel, and in the Epistles and the Apocalypse it designates only a local community, never as with Paul the whole body of believers. In the earlier Gospels it occurs only in Matt. 16:18—"Upon this rock I will build my church," and 18:17—"Tell it unto the church"—passages in which both senses of the word appear. There is no other theme which fills at once so small a space in the teaching of Jesus and so large a space in the teaching of the apostles, especially of Paul. The church appears in the Gospel as a company of disciples following one master. They were united simply by virtue

of their relation to Him. The church is essentially man in fellowship with God, nothing more. The Old Testament church began when Adam walked with God in Paradise, the New Testament church began when Andrew and John walked with Jesus by the banks of the Jordan. When it is said that the Christian church had its origin in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, that is true of its organized activity. If we may so express it, the church then came of age, and entered upon its lifework. But it was born when the first disciples followed Jesus. To inaugurate the new dispensation God reduced the church to its primal elements, restored it to its Edenic simplicity. Priesthood and temple and rites and ordinances were not incorporated with the new economy, they were simply swept away. These things are not of the essence of the church; they are passing forms, and when they have served a temporary purpose they cease to be. The true church was not represented by the Jewish hierarchy, with its splendid temple, its venerable organization, its imposing ritual, but by the little company that followed Jesus. Yet the continuity of the church was not destroyed, as will appear hereafter. Wherever man believes in God and God dwells in man, there the church is found, and only there. A believer, a company of believers, that makes the church, and that alone.

Here we must distinguish between the church visible and the church invisible (see p. 300).

When believers are associated for the worship and service of God much is required for the orderly conduct of the society and the efficient administration of their common interests. There is need of organization, of officers, of sacraments, forms of worship, methods of operation, standards of faith. But these are not of the life of the church. They are necessary but not essential, do not pertain to the essence. Man consists of body and soul, no more. But he has need of food, of raiment, of shelter, of many things that minister to comfort, that are even necessary to life. Yet these things do not make the man, are no part of him. He *is* body and soul, he *needs* food and clothing. So is it with the church. Believers are the church. God has no enduring temple but the soul of man. He that dwelleth in the high and holy place dwelleth also with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit. Milton nobly invokes the Spirit

“that dost prefer  
Before all temples the upright heart and pure.”

For a season men may be commanded to worship in Jerusalem, but the eternal law is, Worship in spirit and in truth ; make thy soul thy temple. The priest was ordained to prepare the way for the universal priesthood of believers. The sanc-

tuary that crowned Moriah was a prophecy of the temple built of living stones that shall cover the whole earth. The symbol yields to the fact. Nothing is *essential* to the church which was not found in Eden and by the banks of the Jordan. The church has existed, may exist, shall exist, without the sacred days and places, rites and forms, which are needful for a time. It had none of them in the beginning, it shall have none of them in the consummation. However necessary they may appear, they are temporary and transient, change their form from age to age, belong to the present state by reason of our infirmity and sin, and are ordained solely to minister to the spiritual life. The outward is only the medium through which truth and grace may be conveyed to the soul. There is no sun, no temple in the New Jerusalem, no distinction between sacred and secular such as now prevails, no holy time or holy place: for there all is holy.

It is obvious that in the judgment of John rites and forms have no value in themselves. They fulfil the purpose for which they were ordained only as they draw us near to God and to our fellow-men. If the relation to Christ which is signified by baptism and the Lord's Supper is *represented* only and not *accomplished*, the sacraments are a badge of falsehood. It is more perilous to trust in ordinances than to neglect them. We must respect and observe them, for they are of God,

but we must regard and treat them only as aids to faith. The life of the church is faith in God, and where faith is wanting form and sacrament are empty show, resembling religion only as a mask resembles a man. We are constantly tempted to worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, to rest in the dead form instead of the living God. If Satan cannot persuade us to neglect the ordinances of religion, he may persuade us to put our trust in them. Christ may be hidden behind His sacraments. This was the truth that the prophets thundered in the ears of Israel. If your heart is not right with God, your sacrifice is abomination, your service is sin. Campbell has caught the spirit of the Gospel in his "Hallowed Ground," one of the noblest odes in our English tongue.

"What's hallowed ground? Has earth a clod  
Its Maker meant not should be trod  
By man, the image of his God,  
Erect and free,  
Unscourged by superstition's rod  
To bow the knee?

\* \* \* \* \*

"Peace! Love! the cherubim that join  
Their spread wings o'er Devotion's shrine,  
Prayers sound in vain, and temples shine,  
Where they are not—  
The heart alone can make divine  
Religion's spot."

The church has made marvellous progress in

nineteen centuries, but confessions, creeds, organizations, systems of doctrine and of polity are dearly purchased, if they mar the simple fellowship with Christ which was enjoyed by the early disciples, and which alone they are designed to promote. Whatever draws the soul to God is a blessing, whatever hinders the soul from God is a curse.

Against the formalism which destroyed the church of the old covenant, and threatens the church of the new, the Gospel of John bears perpetual witness. He dwells with such intensity of thought and purpose upon the spiritual aspects of the truth that the outward and ritual are almost forgotten. He leads us back of the form to the substance, back of the symbol to the fact, back of the sacrament to the truth that it embodies. And always he sets us face to face with God, suffers us to rest in nothing short of Him. There are other portions of the New Testament that treat of the constitution and administration of the church; of officers and rites and sacraments; John brushes away the form, and seizes upon the truth that lies beneath. No words could convey more clearly his thought that the form without the spirit is a lantern without a light, a body without a soul; that the truth alone avails, and that the rite has value only as it serves to convey the truth. The indifference of the Gospel to all that is external is the highest

evidence that the spiritual alone is acceptable with God. No teaching of Isaiah or of Paul upon this theme is more weighty than the silence of John.

It may be said indeed that this silence belongs to the very nature of a *Gospel*. That is true, and it is the very point of our argument. The external finds no place in the *Gospel* because it is not essential. The *Gospel* deals with eternal truth, and the external, however needful it may be, is a passing form. Moreover John wrote a generation later than the earlier evangelists, when the church had assumed visible shape, and his silence is therefore more significant than theirs. And further it is true that he pursues the same course in his Epistles, dwelling upon fundamental principles, and touching upon questions of order and administration only as they were forced upon him, and then in the briefest and most general way.

2. *The Organization of the Church*.—Bishop Lightfoot's *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry* in his Commentary on Philippians is still of the highest value. Compare Calvin, *Instt.* IV, 4. References to the more recent literature of the subject may be found in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, arts. *Bishop* and *Church*.

Here too no explicit teaching is given, and the omission is the more remarkable because the *Gospel* was written toward the close of the cen-

tury, when the constitution of the church had attained a considerable degree of development, a development in which it is impossible to doubt that John bore an important part. Yet so insignificant did matters of polity appear to him in comparison with spiritual truth that neither in Gospel nor Epistles nor Apocalypse does he throw light upon the vexed and difficult questions which relate to the government of the early church. Certain germs and principles of ecclesiastical order, however, may be discovered, and the truth embodied in rite and sacrament is made plain. No detailed system of polity is prescribed in the New Testament, and within certain broad limits the church is left free to develop and modify its organization and methods as circumstances may require. The church is guided not by a written code, but by the living Spirit, and its government is therefore at once flexible and stable, changing its forms to meet the varying conditions of the time, yet ever animated by the same purpose and directed to the same end. The Congregational, the Episcopal, the Presbyterian order may all find support in Scripture, and none of them involves so radical a departure from the New Testament type that it may not be counted a branch of the true church of Christ.

The apostles<sup>1</sup> are represented as the leaders

<sup>1</sup> See Lightfoot on Galatians, Note III, "Name and Office of an Apostle," Hort's *Ecclesia*, ch. 2.

## 298 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

of the infant church, though the word *apostle* occurs only in 13: 16, and there not in an official sense—"a servant is not greater than his lord; neither *one that is sent* greater than he that sent him"; while in his Epistles John styles himself simply *presbyter*, perhaps to designate a closer relation to the local church than the more general term *apostle* would express. They were commissioned to carry on their Master's work—"As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you" (20: 21); to them the Spirit was promised; and they were empowered to remit and retain sins (20: 23), that is, to declare the conditions of forgiveness, and through the discernment given them by the Spirit to pronounce in specific cases whether those conditions were fulfilled. But it must be observed that this grant of power was not conferred upon the apostles alone. Luke says that there were others with them at the time (24: 33), and there is nothing in the narrative to indicate that they only were addressed. The fact appears to be that this authority was bestowed first upon Peter, as the representative of the apostolic company (Matt. 16: 19), then upon all the twelve in connection with the church (Matt. 18: 17, 18), and after the resurrection of Christ the commission was renewed. Cyprian remarks, "And although to all the apostles, after His resurrection, He gives an equal power, . . . yet, that He might set forth unity, He arranged

by His authority the origin of that unity, as beginning from one. Assuredly the rest of the apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power ; but the beginning proceeds from unity " (*Treatise on the Unity of the Church*, § 4). The general power of administration and control was vested in the twelve, and their commission must be interpreted by the manner in which they discharged it. The authority entrusted to them they exercised sometimes over the church, sometimes with the church. By associating the church with them they indicated that the powers which they possessed, so far as those powers are permanent, are lodged in the church, and not in a body of ecclesiastics. The successor of the apostles is the church. Their qualifications as eye-witnesses of the risen Christ and their authority as infallible teachers ceased with them ; but their right of organization and administration resides in the whole body of believers. The choice of a successor to Judas was determined not by the twelve, but by the church (Acts 1: 23-26), and by the church the seven were chosen who first discharged the office of deacon (Acts 6).

In the proper New Testament sense of the term the church is the whole body of believers. As these are divided into several societies, they form churches, branches of the church catholic. Since in the present order of things good and bad are

associated in the church, the distinction arises between the invisible church, composed only of true believers, and the visible church, composed of all professed believers and their children. The distinction is forced upon us by our ignorance. We are compelled to judge men in large degree by their profession. But God reads the heart. Those who are not united to Christ by faith have no part in the life of the church, no share in the promises. The true church is the company of them in whom the Spirit of God abides.. The gift of power is joined with the gift of the Spirit. It is the faithful by whom the society is constituted a church, and to them alone the promises are given. Immeasurable harm has resulted from transferring to an organization precepts and promises which are addressed to believers only. He who is not in Christ has no claim to them. If catholicity and holiness and permanence be the marks of the church, no organization is entitled to the name. The church is not a society of men but a communion of saints. "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (Rom. 9: 6). John draws the distinction in his First Epistle— "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest how that they all are not of us" (2: 19). Elsewhere the New Testament treats of the principles and methods of

polity and government; it is the province of John to attest the truth that the church is essentially not external organization but spiritual fellowship, fellowship of men with God and with one another. Where this spiritual union prevails, there is the church; where it is wanting, no organization, however elaborate, no system, however highly developed in polity and doctrine, is entitled to the name in the sense which it bears in the New Testament. They only are in the church who are in Christ, for the church is the company of those who are renewed and sanctified by His Spirit. They alone are members of the body who are united to the Head.

Of church officers besides the twelve there is no indication in this Gospel, nor in any other. In view of John's attitude towards the spiritual and the ritual it is remarkable that an elaborate hierarchical organization has sprung up under the shadow of his name. Whether John bore a part in the development of church polity, as tradition affirms; whether the *angels of the churches* of Rev. 2, 3 were church officers, and if so whether they were parochial or diocesan bishops; questions of this nature lie beyond our province. But we are compelled to recognize the fact that while the early church represents various stages of development, it exhibits a uniform tendency. Throughout its whole extent it moves in one direction, though not in all parts with equal speed.

The several stages in the historical development of church polity so far as we are able to trace them are these :

(1) Bishop and presbyter were originally titles of the same office. See Lightfoot's note, "*The synonyms bishop and presbyter*," in his commentary on Philippians ; and the article *Bishop* in Hastings' B. D., with the references to recent literature ; and Ellicott's note on 1 Tim. 3 : 1. The contrary view is presented in Vincent's Commentary on Philippians, excursus "*Bishops and Deacons*." Dr. Hort referring to the apostolic church remarks, " Of officers higher than Elders we find nothing that points to an institution or system, nothing like the episcopal system of later times. In the New Testament the word *επίσκοπος* as applied to men, mainly, if not always, is *not* a title, but a description of the Elder's function " (*Ecclesia*, p. 232).

(2) The bishop was distinguished from the presbyter, and parochial episcopacy was established.

(3) Parochial was followed by diocesan episcopacy. It was natural that a personal centre of unity, depository of tradition, and seat of authority should be provided to take the place of the apostles.

(4) As the distinction between presbyters gave rise to parochial episcopacy, so the distinction between bishops gave rise to monarchical

episcopacy, culminating in the Papacy, the catholic rule of the bishops of Rome. After the remark which has been cited regarding the bishops, Dr. Hort goes on to observe that "on the other hand the monarchical principle, which is the essence of episcopacy, receives in the Apostolic age a practical though a limited recognition, not so much in the absolutely exceptional position of St. Peter in the early days of Jerusalem, or the equally exceptional position of St. Paul throughout the Ecclesiæ of his own foundation, as in the position ultimately held by St. James at Jerusalem, and also to a limited extent in the temporary functions entrusted by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus when he left them behind for a little while to complete arrangements begun by himself at Ephesus and in Crete respectively.

" In this as in so many other things is seen the futility of endeavoring to make the Apostolic history into a set of authoritative precedents, to be rigorously copied without regard to time and place, thus turning the Gospel into a second Levitical Code. The Apostolic age is full of embodiments of purposes and principles of the most instructive kind : but the responsibility of choosing the means was left forever to the Ecclesia itself, and to each Ecclesia, guided by ancient precedent on the one hand and adaptation to present and future needs on the other. The lesson-book of the Ecclesia, and of every

Ecclesia, is not a law but a history." In view of the special powers lodged with the apostles there can be no question of the existence of the monarchical principle in the New Testament. But there is no evidence that those powers have been transmitted. They were clearly exceptional and personal, and have no place in the church to-day.

It was the second of these stages to which the church attained within the lifetime and under the guidance of John. "Asia Minor too was the nurse, if not the mother, of episcopacy in the Gentile churches. So important an institution, developed in a Christian community of which St. John was the living centre and guide, could hardly have grown up without his sanction, and, as will be seen presently, early tradition very distinctly connects his name with the appointment of bishops in these parts" (Lightfoot on Philippians, p. 204). This is amply attested by Ignatius. Tradition affirms that he was a pupil of John. It does not concern us to inquire whether the tradition may be trusted, for in any case he bears witness to the form of government that prevailed within the church in the generation after the death of the apostle. The episcopacy of Ignatius, as Lightfoot has shown (*Apostolic Fathers*, Part 2, vol. I, p. 375ff. Compare art. *Ignatius* in Smith and Wace), exhibits the following characteristics:—

- (1) The bishop is distinguished from the presbyter as a separate order.
- (2) The episcopate is generally though not universally established throughout the church.
- (3) It is in no sense a sacerdotal office.
- (4) Though in some sense monarchical, it is far from autocratic.
- (5) "Of a diocese, properly so called, there is no trace. Episcopacy has not passed its primitive stage. The bishop and presbyters are the ministry of a city, not of a diocese."

It should be added that the teaching of John, as of the New Testament throughout, is hostile to every form of sacerdotalism. There is one High Priest, and in Him all believers are priests, and draw near to God through Him alone. Never is the minister termed a priest. He is a teacher and a ruler in the house of God, but he has no sacrifice to offer, and no access to God beyond that which is common to all believers.

The position of Lightfoot, that "the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyterial by elevation; and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them" (*Dissertation*, p. 194), requires modification. It is probable that both tendencies were at work, and the episcopate is the resultant of forces operating in both directions. We cannot determine the relative weight

of each, but in view of the facts already noted we may conclude that the second was the more potent.

See Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, 2: 141.

The episcopate was not *imposed* upon the church but *created* by the church to meet the exigencies of the time and the needs of the growing society.

### THE SACRAMENTS.

*Baptism.*—The baptism of John is referred to in 1; 3: 23; 10: 40. "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples," says John (4: 2), correcting the report that came to the Pharisees, and guarding against a misapprehension which might arise from the statement of 3: 22—"After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized" (comp. 3: 26). That John thought it worth while to make the correction indicates that he regarded the matter as one of some importance. To baptize is the office of the minister and not of the Master. John baptized with water, Jesus baptized with the Holy Spirit. Evidently Jesus looked upon baptism as a subordinate function, and delegated it to others; and when the apostles became the leaders of the church they assumed the same position. In the commission given

them in Matt. 28: 19, and in the addition to Mark, 16: 16, they were commanded to baptize; while Luke in his report refers only to witness-bearing (24: 49; Acts 1: 5, 8). This duty, like their Master, they entrusted to others, if not always yet frequently enough to indicate that with them as with Him it held a secondary place. Peter *commanded* those who were gathered with Cornelius to be baptized after he had himself preached to them the word (Acts 10: 48). Paul thanked God that he had baptized very few in Corinth, "lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name. . . . For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. 1: 14-17).

The reference to baptism with water and the Spirit in 3: 5 has been treated in Chapter 8.

In the admirable commentary of Sanday and Headlam on Romans, p. 123, it is observed that "the significance of baptism lies in the fact that whoever undergoes it is made thereby member of a society, and becomes at once a recipient of the privileges and immunities of that society." But the significance here attached to the ordinance is subordinate and incidental. Believers are not baptized into the church, but into God. It is the sign and seal of an ingrafting into Christ; the symbol of a relation already constituted by faith. This aspect of the truth is well set forth in the same Commentary, note on

"*The Doctrine of Mystical Union with Christ,*"  
p. 162.

*The Lord's Supper.*—To this sacrament there is no direct allusion in the Gospel, there is no record of its institution. The earlier Gospels record the Supper, but omit the last discourse and the prayer; John omits the Supper but records the discourse and the prayer, in which the relation of the Master to the disciples symbolized in the Supper is expressed. The passage which treats of the bread of life (6: 22ff.) has been discussed in chapter 8. There the truth is made plain which throughout the present dispensation is embodied in the sacrament. Here again the Gospel goes beneath the symbol to the fact. Through His death Jesus expiates sin and imparts life, as the blood of the passover lamb was for safety and its flesh for food; and this twofold efficacy of His sacrifice is represented in the Supper.

A striking passage remains to be considered—“ howbeit one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and straightway there came out blood and water. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe. For these things came to pass, that the scripture might be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another scripture saith, “ They shall look on him whom they pierced ”

(19: 34-37). Evidently the flow of blood and water was miraculous. The solemn and emphatic asseveration of the evangelist implies that in his view the phenomenon was so extraordinary as almost to transcend belief, and to require, as it were, the sworn testimony of an eye-witness. And if the flow were a natural discharge, it would indicate that corruption had already set in, which could not be true of Christ. These considerations at once indicate and confirm the judgment of John that he is recording a miracle. "That blood came out was strange; that water also came out was still more so; that both came forthwith, at the one time, and yet distinct from one another, was most marvellous of all" (Bengel in loc.).

The question then emerges, If it was a miracle, what does it signify? What is its message? Of what is it a sign? John has given us his interpretation of it in his First Epistle, not that he is commenting directly upon this passage, but the truth symbolized finds there its exposition. "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and the three agree in one" (5: 6-8). Observe then

(a) the coming by water and blood, (b) the abiding witness that they bear.

(a) The coming by water and blood. The aorist *came*—*εἰλθών*—points to a historical fact. He came, that is, manifested Himself as the Christ. He showed Himself to be the Christ by water and blood. The words following, “not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood”—refer to the same facts, but with more precise definition. He came by water and blood, that is, to explain the phrase, in the (well-known) water (of baptism) and blood (of atonement). First the abstract, water and blood, then the concrete, *the* water and *the* blood; the general, then the particular. And the transition is marked by the change from *διά* to *εν*, from *by* to *with* or *in*. Water and blood are the medium of His revelation as the Christ; the water and the blood of His baptism and sacrifice are the sphere in which He exercises the office of the Christ. The words point unmistakably therefore to His baptism and His death. John baptized with water to make Him manifest to Israel (1 : 31); and He received baptism to fulfil all righteousness (Matt. 3 : 15). This was His initiation to His Messianic work. His blood accomplished the expiation which the water symbolized, and marked the completion of His Messianic work. “He not only undertook, when He came to *baptism*, the task of fulfilling all righteousness (Matt. 3 : 15),

but He also completed it by pouring out *His blood* (John 19: 30); and when this was done, *blood and water* came forth from the side of Jesus Christ, being dead on the cross" (Bengel).

(b) The witness borne. "There are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood." There is the inner witness of the Spirit, the outer witness of the water and the blood. The Spirit bears witness through them, they bear witness through the Spirit. He keeps the work of Jesus in remembrance, and applies the benefits of it to believers; and this He accomplishes in part through the water and the blood of the sacraments. The truths symbolized by the water and the blood are represented in baptism and the Lord's Supper. The continued efficacy of the obedience and the death of Jesus is declared in the church by the sacraments; for baptism is administered in His name, and the Supper shows His death until He come. The blood and water that flowed from His side upon the cross represented in symbol the truths which are permanently symbolized and bear perpetual witness in the sacraments.

"Water is a figure of ablution, and blood of satisfaction. These things are both found in Christ, who, as John says, 'came by water and blood'; that is, to purify and redeem. Of this the Spirit of God is a witness; or rather 'there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the

Water, and the Blood.' In the water and the blood we have a testimony of purgation and redemption; and the Spirit, as the principal witness, confirms and secures our reception and belief of this testimony. This sublime mystery was strikingly exhibited on the cross, when blood and water issued from Christ's sacred side; which on this account Augustine has justly called 'the fountain of our sacraments'" (Calvin, *Instt.* IV, 14, 22.).

Here again it is characteristic of John that alike in Gospel and Epistle he seems to turn out of his way to avoid reference to the ordinance, comes face to face with the sacraments, as it were, yet does not name them, but is content to declare the truth that they are designed to convey. No form of speech could express more weightily his judgment of the relative value of the form and the spirit.

3. *The Unity of the Church.*—The church in all ages is one. Christ was the head of the church of the old covenant, and He built upon the foundation of the law and the prophets. Israel was *His own*. There is no break in the plan and purpose of God, nor in the historic continuity of the church. There is one church from paradise lost to paradise regained, unfolding in successive stages of development. The earliest disciples of Jesus were followers of John the Baptist, and the Old Testament ripened into the New as the bud

bursts into flower. If there is one Head, there can be but one body. The Old Testament church was the body of childhood, the New Testament church is the body of manhood, but the body is one. The old and new covenants have the same God, the same Savior, prescribe the same condition of salvation. Righteousness through faith is the truth that dominates all Scripture. The sacraments of circumcision and the passover answer to baptism and the Lord's Supper. The church is figured by the stream of Ezekiel's vision, that rose to the ankles, then to the knees, then to the loins, then became a river that could not be passed through; "and everything shall live whithersoever the river cometh" (ch. 47).

That in the plan and purpose of God the church is one is shown by the figures employed in Scripture to represent it. It is a building, a body, the branches of a single vine, the flock of one shepherd. The union of many members in one body is strikingly illustrated by the words of Jesus in 17:24—"Father, *that which* thou hast given me, I will that where I am *they* also may be with me." *That which, they*—the many are one. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ" (1 Cor. 12:12).

The unity of the church is at once expressed

and preserved by the method of its growth. God reveals Himself to a single man, a single people, and from this common centre the truth is spread abroad. Abraham is the father of all the faithful, there is one Scripture, the salvation of the world is from the Jews. The new covenant springs out of the old. Jesus is the son of Abraham, the successor of Moses, the heir of David. The word of the Lord goes forth from Jerusalem unto the ends of the earth. If a special revelation were granted to every race, and the church in every land should develop its peculiar type of doctrine and government without organic relation to the church elsewhere, it is evident that even the inner spiritual unity of the church would be seriously impaired. But as the Word is borne from land to land, in the very act of teaching and hearing men of different races are drawn together, and united in bonds of mutual love and service. As there is one Lord and one faith, so there is one baptism; one form as there is one Spirit.

It is obvious that if the church is one, its unity does not consist in a common organization or a common creed; for the church is divided in doctrine and in polity. The church is one because it is animated by one Spirit, obeys one Head. "The unity of the church is threefold. 1. Spiritual; the unity of faith and of communion. 2. Comprehensive; the Church is one as it

is catholic, embracing all the people of God. 3. Historical; it is the same Church in all ages. In all these senses the Church considered as the communion of saints is one; in no one of these senses can unity be predicated of the Church as visible" (*Hodge, Church Polity*, p. 22).

Much perplexity has arisen from confounding bare sameness with identity. They are not equivalent terms. The river is one though its waters are ever changing, though its course may be altered a hundred times, though it may carve for itself a new channel in its haste to reach the sea. The body remains the same through all the physiological changes that pass upon it. In living organisms identity resides in life and not in matter. The church is one throughout its history amid all changes of form and administration because it has one life. It is the soul that makes the body one. When the soul departs, the members fall away. They are related to each other only through the soul, and the bond of union is not carnal but spiritual. They are one because they partake of one life. The church is one because there is one Spirit that dwells within. Apart from the Spirit outward forms are no more than the wires that link together the bones of a skeleton. Organization and ritual cannot make the church one; they can only *manifest* the unity which springs from the possession of a common life. Jesus prayed the Father that His

## 316 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

disciples "may be one, even as we are" (17:11). "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: . . . And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one" (17:20-23). The oneness of believers for which Jesus thrice prayed was such a unity as prevails between the Father and the Son, the possession of a common life.

If this be true, believers are one. They are animated by one Spirit, share one life, inherit one kingdom. Beneath all the differences that divide them, there is an underlying unity that can never be broken. But because this unity is vital and spiritual, it must be wrought out in the experience of the church. Therefore it is always imperfect in fact, is never fully apprehended or realized. In so far as sin lingers in the hearts of believers, their unity is marred. Sin divides and estranges; we turn every one to his own way. Grace unites. As sin prevails we are divided, as grace prevails we are one. In the purpose of God and in its essential nature the church is one; but as the divine idea is gradually and imperfectly realized in human experience the church is divided. Therefore Jesus prayed that believers

might all be one, might come to know that they are one in Him, and to regard one another as members of the same body. Throughout the Scripture, and especially in the Gospel of John, the ideal is constantly set over against the actual. What is required is not that believers be *made* one—they *are* one; but that they come to *recognize* their oneness in Christ and their fellowship one with another. Christ has *made* us one; His work is not complete until we *know* that we are one. A *conscious* unity is our need.

While therefore the unity of the church is inward and spiritual, it must find visible expression. The life must manifest itself. Unity is not uniformity, but differences are tolerable only as they promote unity. Jesus prayed “that they may all be one . . . that the world may believe that thou didst send me . . . that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me” (17:21, 23). Through the oneness of the church the world shall be brought to knowledge and to faith. This oneness then must be visible, evident to the eyes of men. The outward sign of inward unity is brotherly love. “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another” (13:35). The church must come to such a unity if not of order and worship and creed, yet of faith and love and purpose, that all men shall recognize that believers are one

in Christ; must evince one spirit and bear one witness. Only as the church is united shall the world be redeemed. This is the law of the kingdom, the church one, the world won.

The Old Testament church was exclusive, the New Testament church is comprehensive. The barrier between Jew and Samaritan was broken down. Men divided in ritual may be one in spirit. The wall of separation between Jew and Gentile was destroyed. They who were not of the fold of Israel, but were as sheep scattered abroad, must be brought in, that there may be one flock, one shepherd. The New Jerusalem has three gates on every side to welcome men of every land and every tongue. The distinction drawn between men by the gospel is ethical and spiritual. The New Testament is the most catholic of books, for it regards men upon the ground of character alone.

In the purpose of God and in its essential nature, then, the church is one, for it is quickened and sanctified by one Spirit. This spiritual unity must find visible expression, that the world may be led to faith and knowledge. And the outward evidence and expression of unity is brotherly love. Where this prevails, differences of doctrine and worship and polity may remain, but they will hold a subordinate place. The name of *Christian* will take precedence of every other, and all those who bear it will count each other brethren be-

loved, will recognize in every branch of the church a member of the one body of which Christ is the head.

"No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 12: 3). He in whom the Spirit dwells is a child of God, and a brother of all them that believe. "If then," said Peter, when he was called to account for opening the door of the kingdom to the Gentiles, "God gave unto them the like gift as he did also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God?" (Acts 11: 17). The sole and sufficient mark of the believer is the presence of the Spirit, and to withhold fellowship from him in whom the Spirit dwells is to dis-honor the Spirit and to rend the body of Christ. The sin of schism is the lack of love.

The unity for which Jesus prayed is then (*a*) Catholic, embracing all believers. "That which thou hast given me." (*b*) Spiritual. "That they may be one, even as we are one." (*c*) Visible. "That the world may believe," "that the world may know."

4. *The Extension of the Church.*—The world-wide commission given to the eleven in the earlier Gospels is not found in John. Instead of it is given only the injunction to Peter—"Feed my lambs, feed my sheep" (21: 15-17), care for my church. But the Word is the light that lighteth every man. God loved the world

and gave His Son to die that the world might be redeemed. The disciples were taught that they were called not to salvation only but to service; that they were chosen and ordained to go and bring forth fruit. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me," said Jesus, and the promise is fulfilled in the ministry of believers. Through them the Spirit ordinarily bears witness. "Faith cometh by hearing." Jesus prayed not that the disciples should be taken out of the world, for the world has need of them. Saul of Tarsus is the single example in the New Testament of conversion through the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit without the agency of man. John has the world ever in his eye. He uses the word in his writings 105 times, 78 times in the Gospel; while it occurs only 80 times in the whole New Testament besides. The mocking question of the Jews, "Will he go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?" (7: 35), was answered in the mission of the disciples. It was theirs to continue and complete His work, and as He came not to judge the world but to save the world their ministry must be as broad as His. Holiness, beneficence, sacrifice were the characteristic marks of His earthly life; they must characterize His disciples. The work that He began in the body of His flesh He carries on to its completion in His spiritual body, which is the church.

He looked forward, therefore, to the redemption of the world through the church. When He prayed "for them also which believe on me through their word"—not "which *shall* believe" . . . He thought not only of the little company of disciples already gathered, but of the innumerable multitude of which they were the first fruits. He looked upon His work as already accomplished, His sacrifice as already offered (17:4), the number of the redeemed as already complete. The disciples are called that through them others may believe, and that the world may be brought to faith and knowledge, may believe and know that He is sent from God, and that through Him men enjoy the Father's love.

If the question is asked, why God entrusts this work to men, why the march of His kingdom must keep pace with the lagging footsteps of the church, the answer in part has already been suggested. This method is in accord with the uniform course of His providence; it respects and preserves the unity of the race and of the kingdom; it secures the development and exercise of those powers which are essential to the healthy and vigorous life of the church. Christ makes us like Himself by giving us His work to do.

The parting gifts of Jesus were three; He committed His mother to John, His disciples to the Father, the world to His disciples.

The method illustrated in the first chapter of

the Gospel is the method divinely ordained and approved. Andrew findeth Simon, Philip findeth Nathanael. It is the method of personal approach. One by one men must be led to Christ. No better way of extending the kingdom has been discovered or devised than the way of Andrew. There is in the Gospel no hint of the organized activity of the church, it is the individual service of believers of which the Master speaks. Organization becomes essential when the number of the disciples is multiplied, but it is designed not to supersede but to develop the individual. Individualism is the characteristic note of the Gospel. All is ordained for the man, all depends on the man. Organizations come and go, man endures, for in him alone is the breath of the Almighty. It is personal faith and personal service on which the Gospel everywhere insists. The church exists for the sake of the world, that is, it is designed to conquer and absorb the world. If that is the mission of the church, it is the mission of each individual believer. His are the feet with which the church must journey, the hands with which the church must minister, the tongue with which the church must speak, the lips with which the church must pray, the brain and heart with which the church must think and feel. The church has neither eyes nor ears nor hands nor feet nor tongue nor lips nor brain nor heart but his, no money but his, no service but

his. Unless the church gives to the world his money, his prayers, his sympathy, his service, it has nothing to give. The church is a shadow, the body is the man. The kingdom shall hasten its coming when every disciple becomes an apostle; obeys the twofold command, Come unto Me, then, Go into all the world; recognizes that he is charged with a divine commission, and that it is the great concern of his life to continue the work of his Master, who came and suffered and died to lead lost men to God.

## XI

### THE END OF ALL THINGS

THE eschatology of the New Testament must be drawn chiefly from the discourses of Jesus and the Epistles of Paul. Peter starts more questions than he answers. It is often asserted that John knows nothing of a personal and visible return of Christ, a general resurrection, a final judgment. With him all is inward and spiritual. "The world's history is the world's judgment," and there is no other. How far this is in accord with the facts will appear as we proceed. We shall find in John no detailed representation of the future, or of any single feature of it, such as Jesus has furnished of the last judgment in Matthew 25, and Paul of the resurrection in 1 Cor. 15. But allusions are not wanting, and from them we may gather a distinct though partial conception of the time to come.

Four themes require consideration—the Second Coming of Christ, the Resurrection, the Judgment, the Future State.

1. *The Second Coming*.—See Godet, *Introd. to N. T.*, Vol. 2, p. 193. Hastings' B. D., Art. *Parousia*.

Christ has been in the world from the begin-

ning, its Maker, Ruler, Light, Life. What then is meant by His coming? How can He come who is always present? He is said to come whenever He grants a special revelation of His power, His grace. Thus He came to Israel (1: 11), though He was with them always. *Coming is manifestation.* "Why is it that Thou goest away? Why is it that Thou comest again? If I understand Thee aright, Thou withdrawest not thyself either from the place Thou goest from, or from the place Thou comest from: Thou goest away by becoming invisible, Thou comest by again becoming manifest to our eyes" (Augustine on John, Tract. 68: 3). So the lightning which is the figure of His advent (Matt. 24: 27) is the local manifestation of a force which is everywhere diffused.

Three several comings or manifestations of Christ are named in John. With each of them one stage of revelation is brought to a close, and another and higher stage begins. They mark the origin, the progress, and the triumph of the kingdom of God in its New Testament form.

(a) His coming in the flesh, which marked the close of the old and the beginning of the new dispensation. *He was manifested in the flesh* (1 John 1: 2; 3: 5, 8) and *He came in the flesh* (1: 14; 1 John 4: 2; 2 John 7) are convertible terms. This has been sufficiently treated in chapter 4.

(b) His final coming. This too is termed a manifestation, epiphany. "We know that, if he shall be manifested we shall be like him ; for we shall see him even as he is" (1 John 3 : 2). The technical term *παρουσία* occurs but once in John —"And now, my little children, abide in him ; that, if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his *coming*" (1 John 2 : 28); where it refers, according to the common usage of the New Testament, to the final advent. Later writers apply the word also to the incarnation, which they term *the first coming*. (See Lightfoot's note on Ignatius to Phil. 9 : 7.) It signifies properly *presence*, and denotes therefore not merely *coming*, but *coming to stay*.

That He shall return in person is implied in the prediction that He shall raise and judge the dead (5 : 21ff.) ; but is explicitly affirmed in the Gospel only in 21 : 22—"If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ?" The endeavor is constantly made to break the force of the words. Many scholars refer them to the destruction of Jerusalem, supposing that the event predicted must fall within the lifetime of the apostle. But that is the very error against which the evangelist seeks to guard his readers. "Jesus said not unto him that he should not die, but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ?" The disciples evidently understood Him

to refer to His second coming, for “ this saying therefore went forth among the brethren, that that disciple should not die ; ” and they were not wrong in this, but only in overlooking the hypothetical form of the expression—even if I should choose to keep him alive until I come. The words convey a strong assertion of His power over the lives of men, and His right to deal with them as He will ; and a rebuke to the spirit that prompted the question, “ What shall this man do ? ” He is mine, and whether his life shall be prolonged even until I come again is mine alone to determine.

On the seventh day, says Thomas Aquinas, was the consummation of nature ; in the Incarnation of Christ the consummation of grace ; at the end of the world the consummation of glory (1 : 73, 1).

We may proceed to consider the manner, the time, the purpose, of the second coming.

*The Manner.*—If the promise of His return is merely a figurative representation of the triumph of the gospel, the resurrection and the judgment which are associated with it should also be understood figuratively. But the language is too precise and clear to admit of that interpretation. As the gospel dispensation is inaugurated so it shall be consummated by the personal and visible manifestation of the Son of God. That the descrip-

tion is couched in terms which are largely symbolical we may readily believe, but that Christ shall come again visibly and gloriously is too plainly taught throughout the New Testament to be denied. "This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven" (Acts 1:11). In the sacrament of the Supper He is always present in the Spirit, yet "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11:26). Evidently something beyond His spiritual presence is signified; and that, according to the uniform teaching of the New Testament, is His coming in glory. It may be held that the disciples misinterpreted the promise of the Master, but that they understood Him to teach His personal and visible return cannot be questioned. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven" (1 Thess. 4:16). The prophecies of the New Testament can no more be satisfied by a purely spiritual coming than the prophecies of the Old.

For a recent and able defense of the view that Christ shall come again only in the power of the Spirit see Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 436.

*The Time.*—Jesus taught that this was hidden even from Him, and was known to God only (Mark 13:32. The text in Matt. 24:36 is doubtful. See Broadus). Various attempts have

been made to evade the plain meaning of the words, but in vain. See chapter 4, p. 135. It was part of His humiliation that in His human nature He denied Himself the knowledge of the time. As God He determined it, as man He was ignorant of it. The early church knew that the time was uncertain, and that His coming should be sudden, as of a thief in the night. It was foretold indeed that certain events should precede the advent, but how long they should require was not revealed, and their nature and order were and are far from clear. Not unreasonably the first generation of believers supposed that He might return at any time. The only hint of time given in the Gospel or Epistles of John is in 1 John 2: 18—"It is the last hour." The coming of Christ in the flesh was "in the end of the times" (1 Peter 1: 20), "the last days" (Acts 2: 17); "in the fulness of the time" (Gal. 4: 4); for it marked the close of the old economy. The second coming marks the close of the present dispensation, and the time precedent and preparatory is the last hour. Obviously *the last days* (2 Peter 3: 3; 2 Tim. 3: 1; Jas. 5: 3), *the last time* (Jude 18; 1 Peter 1: 5), *the last hour*, may signify the whole period of the New Testament dispensation, or that closing portion of it which immediately precedes and ushers in the final coming. The context alone can determine which is meant in each particular

case. The natural though not necessary interpretation of John's phrase, *the last hour*, apparently one of the most definite notes of time anywhere given in the New Testament representation of the future, is that he conceived of the return of Christ as imminent. It may be said in general that what was hidden from the Master was not revealed to the disciples; that they were aware of their ignorance; that they believed that He might return during their lifetime. Various expressions betray this expectation. But whatever they believed, they have not attempted to fix the time. As they shared the opinions of their age regarding the phenomena of nature, yet nowhere contradict the teachings of modern science, so they may have believed that Christ should come again in their own day, but they have nowhere committed themselves to that belief so as to give it explicit statement. They believed much that they did not teach. It should not be said, "what the Apostles believed, we are bound to believe" (*Hodge, Syst. Theol.* 3 : 793), but, what the apostles *taught* we are bound to believe. Dr. Hodge has expressed himself more accurately elsewhere—"We must distinguish between their personal expectations and their teaching. The latter alone is infallible" (*Confer. Papers* XLV). It is possible to infer from casual allusions that they held mistaken views upon matters concerning which they had no

revelation, and of which therefore they did not venture to speak plainly. Their inspiration extended only to that which they were commissioned to teach. Otherwise they held the common opinions of their time. Paul distinguishes between "the commandment of the Lord" and his own "judgment" (1 Cor. 7: 25), and Godet aptly remarks, "the words are very instructive, as showing with what precision he distinguished the apostolical inspiration from Christian inspiration in general, making the former not only the highest degree, but something specifically different from the second." The apostles were charged with a specific message, and in delivering it they were preserved from error. But beyond the range of that message they were left to the exercise of their own powers with no other guidance of the Spirit than that which is vouchsafed to all believers. It may be said that their inspiration was of a twofold nature, positive and negative—the Spirit qualified them to speak the truth and withheld them from teaching error, restrained them from venturing beyond the limits of their commission. Therefore, though they may have held erroneous views upon many subjects, they have taught nothing that is not true.

*The Purpose.* The final coming of Christ is uniformly associated in John, as throughout the New Testament, with the end of the world, the

## 332 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

general resurrection, the last judgment. It cannot be said that the doctrine of John necessarily excludes a millennial reign of Christ upon the earth preceding the judgment. But the natural interpretation of his words is against it. We must recognize the fact that as in the Old Testament there are two classes of passages which foretell the coming of Christ, one portraying His humiliation and the other His glory; so in the New Testament there are two classes of passages relating to His second coming, one of which seems to indicate that He shall come to inaugurate and the other that He shall come to close the millennium. The same difficulty that confronted the Jew confronts the Christian, the difficulty of harmonizing these apparently discordant representations. Theories are often framed upon the principle of selection; one class of passages is taken and the other left. But to the challenge, It is written, we must answer, It is written again. The theory must embrace all the facts. Nowhere is caution more imperative. We cannot discuss the question here, but it may be said that the decided preponderance of New Testament teaching is in favor of the post-millennial view, whether the millennium be the present dispensation, as Augustine taught, comprehending the whole period between the first and second advents, or the closing stage of it alone. Christ shall come to put an end to the existing order,

and to sit in judgment upon mankind. Then shall He render to every man according to His works.

In treating of the future it becomes us to speak with the utmost modesty and reserve. The words of Dr. Hodge are worth remembering in the day when expositions of prophecy abound: "The utter failure of the Old Testament Church in interpreting the prophecies relating to the first advent of Christ, should teach us to be modest and diffident in explaining those which relate to his second coming" (*Syst. Theol.* 3: p. 791). "There is every reason to believe that the predictions concerning the second advent of Christ, and the events which are to attend and follow it, will disappoint the expectations of commentators, as the expectations of the Jews were disappointed in the manner in which the prophecies concerning the first advent were accomplished" (Id. p. 844). A recent work of an able and popular evangelist, "*God's Methods with Man,*" by the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, contains the singular statement that the post-millennial "view of the coming of Christ is only two hundred years old, theologically; for, prior to the period indicated, it was the general belief of the Church that the Millennium would be ushered in by His advent" (p. 50). Compare with this the careful words of Dr. S. H. Kellogg, himself an ardent premillenarian, in Schaff-Herzog Cyclop. Vol. 3, p. 1888

—Art. *Premillennialism.* “It is commonly agreed by the best modern historians that, from the death of the apostles to the time of Origen, premillennialism was the general faith of those who were regarded as strictly orthodox Christians.

. . . The first recorded opponent of the doctrine was Caius, a presbyter of Rome, about the beginning of the third century, from which time . . . *Chiliasm rapidly declined.* . . .

When in Constantine Christianity reached the throne of the Roman empire, the church soon settled in the belief, shortly afterwards confirmed by the weighty authority of Augustine, that the millennium reign, formerly expected to begin with the second advent, was really to be reckoned from the first, and was therefore a realized fact in the triumph of the church over the heathen state. *That doctrine with unessential modifications, remained the universal faith of the church for a full thousand years, during which premillennialism can hardly be said to have existed*” (italics mine).

The whole article may be consulted with profit, and shows how little foundation there is for the assertion constantly repeated that premillennialism has been the historic and almost universal faith of the church from the beginning. See also Lee in the Speaker’s Commentary on Revelation, *Excursus on the Millennium*, p. 808.

His first and second comings are alike in that both are personal and visible; they are unlike in

manner and in purpose: the one in the flesh, the other in glory, the one to save and the other to judge the world. "And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment; so Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin"—not now as a sin offering—"to them that wait for him, unto salvation" (Heb. 9:27, 28). The thought of judgment, though not expressed, is implied in the limitation of salvation to *them that wait for him*. Man dies and is judged. The natural antithesis would be, Christ died, and returns to judge. But the more comprehensive and characteristic term is chosen, not judgment but salvation.

(c) The period between His first and second comings is spanned by His coming in the Spirit. He is always present with His church, but from time to time He grants His people special revelations of His grace and power. His coming is the visible manifestation of His invisible presence. He returned in the power of the Spirit at Pentecost, and His presence has never been withdrawn. It is characteristic of the Gospel that it barely refers to His final coming, and lays the emphasis upon His coming in the Spirit. His visible return and final triumph are portrayed in the Apocalypse. "The writings of John form a trilogy. The Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, represent the evangelic founding, the

## 336 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

organic shaping, and the eternal future of the church ; Christ who was, and is, and is to come" (Lange on John, Introd. Sec. 2).

The Spirit does not take the place of Jesus, so that He is no longer with His disciples. The promise of His return is too precise and definite to be explained away. He comes in and with the Spirit. Father, Son, and Spirit take up their abode in the believer (14: 23); but it is through the Spirit that the love of God is shed abroad in the heart, and through the Spirit that the Son is made known. We know the historical Christ through the Word, we know the indwelling Christ through the Spirit, who is the interpreter of the Godhead. His spiritual coming is His manifestation of Himself through the Spirit.

As His coming is His presence made manifest, the promise *I come unto you* (14: 18) has various fulfilments. To His disciples He manifests Himself as He does not unto the world (14: 22). The world neither saw nor knew the Spirit (14: 17); Jesus it saw but did not know, and after His resurrection saw Him no more, while the disciples on the other hand then began to see Him and know Him more clearly. "In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you" (14: 19, 20). When He was glorified the Spirit was given, and through the Spirit only is He known.

This spiritual coming is the main theme of

chapters 14-16. An initial and partial fulfilment of the promise *I come* may be found in His appearances after His resurrection. Then too He manifested Himself (21 : 1). But the promise is far larger, and signifies nothing less than His abiding presence with His people with special manifestations from time to time. This is the force of the present tense, *I come*. There is no instance in the Gospel in which His coming denotes a historical crisis, as in Matt. 16 : 28 ; 24 ; 26 : 64, where the fall of Jerusalem is indicated. The judgment of Israel prefigured the judgment of the world. In the Apocalypse Christ is represented as coming to judge the churches that have proved unfaithful (2 : 5, 16 ; 3 : 3). There are two distinct events which are particularly termed *comings* in the Gospel.

(1) The descent of the Spirit at Pentecost. Henceforth Jesus teaches and guides His disciples through the Spirit. The promise includes not merely the descent but the permanent abiding of the Spirit. He came, He is come, He abides. There are no backward steps ; the march of the kingdom is ever onward. In the course of human history no revelation once given is ever withdrawn ; no gift once conferred is ever cancelled : "For the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11 : 29). The Spirit once given is given forever.

(2) The death of the believer. To this the

## 338 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

promise relates, " If I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself ; that where I am, there ye may be also " (14 : 3). The words point to a definite time and place, and are not satisfied by a general reference to the manifestation of the Spirit. Nor can they be referred to the second coming ; for as He spoke to comfort His disciples in view of His departure, the words seem to imply that He should return during their lifetime. But how could He confess Himself ignorant of the time yet fix it within such narrow limits ? And how could He promise to return within the lifetime of His disciples when He explicitly foretold the death of some of them (16 : 2 ; 21 : 19 ; Matt. 24 : 9) ? The promise was addressed in the first instance to them ; but if this be the meaning of it, it was never fulfilled. It is true that elsewhere the believer is always represented as going to Christ, but the transition is easy from the thought of His waiting to receive the soul of the believer (Acts 7 : 56, 59) to the thought of His coming to receive it. The phrase has a peculiar fitness because death is to the believer what the parousia is to the world, the end of the lower and the beginning of the higher stage. To the individual and the world alike the fixed points in the unfolding of the future are the coming of Christ and the judgment. Believers are with Him immediately at death. There is no intermediate place.

He said that when He left the earth He would return to the Father (16: 28), there John and Paul and Stephen saw Him, thither He takes His own to be with Him where He is. That is heaven.

There are thus three comings of Christ according to John: in the flesh, to make atonement for sin; in the Spirit, to apply the benefits of His atonement; in glory, to judge the world. They mark the inauguration, the progress, the triumph of His kingdom. He comes in the Spirit to complete the purpose of His coming in the flesh, and to prepare for His coming in glory. The Old Testament taught, Christ shall come; the New Testament teaches, Christ has come, is coming, shall come. The philosophy of history may be written in a sentence: All before the incarnation was ordered to prepare the way for His coming in the flesh to save the world; all after the incarnation is ordered to prepare the way for His coming in glory to judge the world. His first and second comings are the points that determine the course of history.

2. *The Resurrection*.—On the doctrine of the resurrection and the last judgment among the Jews, see Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the time of Christ*, II, 2, p. 179ff. Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Bk. III, ch. 9, Edersheim, *Life of Christ*, appendix XIX.

The resurrection shall be universal, of good

and bad alike. "All that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" (5 : 28, 29). Jesus taught elsewhere the resurrection of the wicked—"rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10 : 28). It is probable that the teaching of the Old Testament does not go beyond Israel (Oehler, *O. T. Theol.* § 226). Paul's teaching is in accord with John's. The general judgment involves the general resurrection. He took part with the Pharisees who held the doctrine—"touching the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question" (Acts 23 : 6), and on one occasion explicitly affirmed it—"Having hope towards God which these also themselves look for, that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust" (Acts 24 : 15.)

It is further probable, though the majority of modern scholars seem to be of the contrary opinion, that 1 Cor. 15 : 21, 22 should be so interpreted—"For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead: for as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." The phrase ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν is naturally understood of the general resurrection (15 : 12, 13). If the reference were to believers only, we should expect ἀνάστασις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν according to the common New Testament usage when a class is designated—Lightfoot on Philippians 3 : 11; Plummer on Luke 20 : 35, and

Comms. of Ellicott, Meyer, and Godet in loc.  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , again, should be given the same extension in both clauses, unless there are other considerations which forbid. The comparison is closely drawn— $\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ ,  $\omega\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ . It is evident from John 5:21 and from Romans 4:17; 8:11, that  $\zeta\omega\sigma\pi\omega\iota\epsilon\bar{\nu}$  may be used of the quickening of the dead; and indeed it is so used figuratively in verse 36 of this chapter. It is true of all the dead that they are made alive in Christ, for it is His voice that calls them from the grave (5:25). Paul treats first of the general resurrection, which his opponents denied, and then proceeds to treat at length of the resurrection of believers. There is an intimation of the judgment of the wicked in verse 25—"He shall put all enemies under his feet." Both the exegesis of the passage therefore and the general tenor of New Testament teaching favor the larger reference. Paul teaches that all the dead shall be raised to life by Christ, but he dwells only upon the resurrection of the just. As it was the resurrection of the body that was in question, he first established the general truth, and then proceeded to demonstrate the consequences of the resurrection in the case of the righteous. The same course of argument is followed in verses 12-19, the main truth established, then the particular consequences deduced.

*The Time.*—This is expressed by the phrase *in the last day* (6:39, 40, 54; 11:24). In 5:25-29

a double resurrection is foretold—spiritual in verse 25, from trespasses and sins; physical in verses 28, 29. In verse 21 both are included—"For as the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son also quickeneth whom he will." The general statement is distributed in the verses following. The quickening of dead souls is already begun—"The hour cometh, *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live"; the bodily resurrection is yet to come—"all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." One is progressive, the other simultaneous.

If the exegesis of Rev. 20:4-6—"I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God. . . . And they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished. This is the first resurrection"—should require an interval between the resurrection of the just and that of the unjust, there would be no necessary conflict with the Gospel. But the natural interpretation of 5:29 is that all are raised together, and it is better to take the plain statements of the Gospel, partial and imperfect though they are, as the basis of the harmony rather than the highly figurative representations of the Apocalypse. No book besides has been so tortured as that which closes the canon of the New Testament. Sym-

bols and figures are put upon the rack of history and chronology, and poetry is turned to arithmetic. Statistics take the place of visions. The seer whose eye swept the circle of the universe, and surveyed earth and heaven, time and eternity, is reduced to the level of the annalist engaged upon a bare chronicle of events and dates. The Revelation is the work of one who possessed the imagination of a poet, the heart of a child, and the ripe experience of a saint grown old in the ways of God; and he alone can interpret it in whom the spirit of John is found. To insist upon a literal interpretation of the book is to rob it of its poetic and prophetic character. It was written in the Spirit, in the Spirit only can it be understood.

3. *The Judgment.*—As there is a twofold resurrection, there is likewise a twofold judgment; the one inward and personal, the other outward and general.

The judgment as the resurrection is universal, embracing the just and the unjust. "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10). This is not inconsistent with the word of Christ in John 5:24—"He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment;" for there it is the

judgment of condemnation that is meant, as is plain from verse 29—"the resurrection of life . . . the resurrection of judgment." Life as well as death is the award of the Judge. "Before him shall be gathered all the nations; and he shall separate them," saying to those on the right hand, Come; and to those upon the left, Depart (Matt. 25 : 31ff.). Therefore John affirms that "Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment" (1 John 4 : 17); and bids us "abide in him; that, if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming" (1 John 2 : 28).

The attitude of men towards Christ reveals their character and seals their destiny. What they are is discovered by their relation to Him. "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (18 : 37), "For judgment came I into this world, that they which see not may see; and that they which see may become blind" (9 : 39). At death judgment is pronounced, and the soul goes to its own place. "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23 : 43). What purpose then is served by the general judgment? Why are men judged together when they have already been judged singly? To this question no answer is returned in Scripture. The fact is made plain, the reason is not assigned. It is often said that the general assize shall be held to vindicate the

justice of God in presence of the assembled universe. But Scripture gives no intimation of the kind; and it is difficult to see how this purpose could be served unless our comprehension were immeasurably enlarged; nor does it appear consonant with the character of God that He should invite His creatures to sit in judgment upon His providence. Every man's conscience shall bear witness that his own sentence is just, and we are not called or qualified to pronounce upon the dealings of God with our fellow-men. If man only was concerned in the judgment, the simplest explanation would be that according to the psychology of the New Testament the body is regarded as essential to complete manhood, and final sentence is therefore deferred until the whole man, body, soul and spirit, is arraigned at the bar of judgment. But the angels too are to be judged (1 Cor. 6:3; 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6), and in their case some other reason must be sought. We may conclude that the general purpose of the last judgment is not the *vindication* but the *exhibition* of God's justice and mercy, to the glory of His name, the confusion of His foes, and the honor of His saints. If other interests are served and other purposes fulfilled, they are not made known.

Judgment is the peculiar prerogative of the Father. "I seek not mine own glory," said Jesus, "there is one that seeketh and judgeth"

(8:50). To the Father "there is one that accuseth you, even Moses" (5:45). He is the husbandman, by whom the branches of the vine are pruned (15:1). Christ is our Advocate before Him (1 John 2:1). But the exercise of judgment He commits to the Son (5:22). The full statement of the doctrine is given in Rom. 2:16—"God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ." "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained" (Acts 17:31). As He created the world through the Son, and redeems the world through the Son, so He shall judge the world through the Son. The Son judges according to the Father's will. "As I hear, I judge" (5:30. Comp., Is. 11:3).

In representing Christ as the judge, the Scripture never loses sight of His relation to the Father. This appears in those passages which most vividly portray His divine power and glory. In Matthew 25:31-46 He is seated upon the throne of judgment, and all the nations are gathered before Him. His voice pronounces sentence, and assigns to the evil and the good their eternal portion. But those whom He summons to inherit the kingdom are the "blessed of My Father" (verse 34). And in the Epistles to the seven churches, which depict Him clothed with all the attributes of deity, He is still the Son

of God (Rev. 2:18); the authority which He promises to him that overcometh, He has received of the Father (Rev 2:27); the name of the victor He will confess before the Father (Rev. 3:5); four times in a single verse He uses the term *My God* (Rev. 3:12); and the closing words of promise are: "He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcome, and sat down with my Father in his throne" (Rev. 3:21). Compare Matthew 7:21, where also Christ is represented as the judge: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of *my Father* which is in heaven."

To this office Christ was appointed because He is Son of man (5:27). Elsewhere in the Gospels the phrase *Son of man* has invariably the article with both nouns. Here only is the article omitted with both. The only other instances of this construction in the New Testament are found in Rev. 1:13, and 14:14, where, however, the expression is, *one like a son of man*. (So the Revised Version, with the *Son of man* in the margin.) By the omission of the articles in this instance emphasis is laid upon the nature rather than upon the person of Christ. He is constituted Judge by virtue of His office as Mediator; He is Mediator by virtue of the fact that He added the human nature to the divine. Because

He is the only Mediator between God and man, the character and destiny of men are determined by their personal relation to Him. This is the ultimate ground of His appointment as Judge.

The purpose of His appointment is "that all may honor the Son, even as they honor the Father" (5: 23). The glory of the Triune God, comprehending the highest good of the creature, is the final cause of creation and redemption, of the universe and of the mediatorial kingdom of Christ. Since He is the complete and perfect revelation of God, His glory and that of the Father are one.

Judgment thus holds a conspicuous place among the offices of Christ. Yet the purpose of His mission was not judgment but salvation. This is often affirmed: "For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him" (3: 17). "Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man" (8: 15). "And if any man hear my sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world" (12: 47). But judgment, though foreign to the purpose, is the necessary result of His mission wherever unbelief prevails. The world is already under condemnation by reason of sin: "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God *abideth* on him" (3: 36). "He that heareth my word . . . hath passed out of death into

life" (5: 24). A new and more heinous sin is added in the rejection of the Savior. "He that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil" (3: 18, 19). If the salvation which He proffers were accepted by all, no place would be found for judgment, for there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8: 1). He speaks, therefore, not of the purpose but of the inevitable issue of His mission, when He says, "For judgment came I into this world, that they which see not may see; and that they which see may become blind" (9: 39). "I judge no man. Yea, and if I judge"—if by the unbelief of men I am compelled to judge—"my judgment is true" (8: 16). Compare 8: 26—"I have many things to speak and to judge concerning you."

The distinction thus drawn between the design and the effect of His coming is indicated also in Matt. 10: 34: "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."

Here we may note John's doctrine of anti-christ. The term is peculiar to John, who uses it only in his Epistles (1 John 2: 18, 22; 4: 3; 2 John 7). He speaks of many antichrists. Every

one is antichrist who denies that Jesus is the Christ, or that He is come in the flesh. Whether the spirit of antichrist shall finally be embodied in a single person or power, as Paul teaches, John in his Epistles neither affirms nor denies; but he refers to the coming of antichrist as a truth already familiar to his readers: "As ye heard that antichrist cometh" (1 John 2: 18); "This is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come" (1 John 4: 3): and his teaching must, therefore, be interpreted in harmony with that of Christ and of Paul. The several anti-christs are types and organs of the antichrist who is to come; and the Apocalypse shows that the ultimate representative of the spirit of antichrist shall be a person or power in whom the might of Satan shall be concentrated, and in whom it shall be destroyed. There are many false prophets (1 John 4: 1; Matt. 24: 5, 24; Mark 13: 6), yet there is one false prophet (Rev. 13: 11-18; 19: 20). Antichrist is many, yet one, and in this regard his kingdom is the counterfeit of the church of Christ, which consists of many members with one head, animated by one spirit, and forming one body (1 Cor. 12: 12).

The rule of judgment is the Word of God. The law and the gospel are parts of one divine revelation. Therefore Moses is the accuser of those who do not accept Christ (5: 45). Men shall be judged by the word that Christ has

spoken, because His word is the word of God. "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him ; the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I spake not from myself ; but the Father which sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (12 : 48, 49). Jesus does not accuse man, but Moses ; He shall not judge them, but His word.

As the Word of God is the rule of life, obedience of course is the condition required. And the first commandment of the Word is faith in Christ. "This is the work of God"—the work that God requires, on which, as the context shows, eternal life depends—"that ye believe on him whom he sent" (6 : 29). The thought of judgment according to works, as in Paul—"who will render to every man according to his works" (Rom. 2 : 6. Compare the parables of the talents and the pounds, and the representation of the judgment in Matt. 25 : 31–46), appears in 5 : 28, 29—"all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment"—and there only in the Gospel. In these good or evil works faith, indeed, is included. Faith is preeminently the work of God (6 : 29). Works are the revelation of character, and moral char-

acter is determined by the presence or absence of faith. "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham . . . Ye do the works of your father . . . Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do" (8: 39, 41, 44). "Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God" (1 John 3: 10). "He that doeth good is of God; he that doeth evil hath not seen God" (3 John 11). Compare Rev. 20: 12, 13: "And the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works . . . And they were judged every man according to their works." The condition of salvation is not works, but faith manifested by works. So is Matt. 12: 37 to be understood—"For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Believers do not obey that they may be saved, but because they are saved. They serve not for wages as servants, but for love as children. Obey and live is the word of the law, live and obey is the word of the gospel. We are saved by faith, we are judged by works: for works are the evidence and the measure of faith. They register the movements of the inner life, and bear open witness.

The ground of salvation, then, is nothing meritorious in man, in his character or in his works. The believer is drawn by the Father (6: 44, "No man can come to me except the Father which

sent me draw him"), born again of the Spirit (" Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God . . . Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God " [3: 3, 5], and finds in Christ the way, the truth, and the life [14: 6]. Life is the gift of Christ: " My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life " [10: 27, 28]. Compare 1 John 5: 11—" God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." ) The fine linen in which the bride, the Lamb's wife, is arrayed, which is the righteous acts of the saints (Rev. 19: 8), is washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 7: 14), and to Him is rendered all the praise of their salvation by the redeemed in heaven (Rev. 5: 9-14; 7: 10—" Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb " ).

Neither the Gospel nor the New Testament pronounces judgment upon those to whom Christ has not been made known. The emphasis is laid upon the sin of unbelief, and the case of those who have not received the gospel is not considered. This is among the secret things that belong to God. The sin of the world and the duty of the church are made plain, but curious questions receive no reply. Those who ask, Are they few that be saved? are reminded to look to themselves (Luke 13: 23, 24). It may be said that the largest room for hope is afforded by the

system that most highly magnifies divine grace, and finds the ultimate ground of salvation in the sovereign choice of God instead of the depraved will of man. When we look to earth the prospect is dark, but there is light above. We are permitted to hope that even among the heathen there are those who are called of God to eternal life, redeemed by the sacrifice of Him who died for the world, and regenerated by the Spirit who worketh according to His own will. See Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Bk. VI, ch. 4, p. 530.

The sentence passed upon men at death and ratified in the day of judgment is final and irrevocable. Scripture allows no room for a state of probation beyond the grave. "All that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment" (5: 28, 29). "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5: 10). "They that *have done* good—they that *have done* ill"; "Receive the things *done in the body*"—language could not declare more plainly that the basis of judgment is the present life. When the breath leaves the body the account is closed, and on that account final sentence is pro-

nounced. It is of the mercy of God that we are not compelled to balance forever between good and evil, that opportunity is given us to make a decisive and final choice. And as men are judged according to the measure of light that they have enjoyed, as all the circumstances of their lives receive due consideration, and penalty is proportioned to guilt, neither the justice nor the mercy of God may be impeached. If it should appear irrational and unjust that the sins of earthly life should be visited with eternal punishment, it must be remembered that destiny is the fruit of character ; that character is fixed at death ; and that the wicked suffer eternal death because they are guilty of eternal sin. This life is a probation because it is the period in which character is formed ; and destiny follows character inevitably. We are judged according to our works because in them character is betrayed.

Such is the doctrine of judgment in the Fourth Gospel. Judgment belongs to the Father and by Him is committed to the Son, on the ground of His mediatorial office, that all may honor the Son as they honor the Father. The exercise of judgment, which does not belong to the *purpose*, but is the inevitable *result* of His mission by reason of the unbelief of men, found place in His earthly life, and in the last great day all men shall stand before Him for final sentence. The standard of judgment shall be the Word of God,

which requires faith in Christ as the condition of salvation. The issue of that judgment shall be to the unbeliever eternal death, to the believer eternal life. John strikes no discordant note in the inspired chorus, and his teaching upon this theme, as upon every other, blends in harmony with the teaching of all Scripture, which came not by the will of man, but from men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.

4. *The Future State.*—Upon the mystery that vails the future the Scripture alone throws light. The torch of philosophy is extinguished in the tomb. To that undiscovered country which lies beyond, experience affords no guide. Only the light of revelation can illumine the grave and penetrate the darkness that hides the world to come. Scripture constantly appeals to the hopes and fears that gather about the life that awaits us there, and no questions concern us more deeply than those which touch upon our immortal state.

The issue of judgment is life to the righteous and death to the wicked. “All that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment” (5: 28, 29). That judgment is death. We are by nature under sentence of death by reason of our sin, and the sentence is remitted only on condition of repent-

ance and faith. "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (8: 24). Death is of nature, life is of grace. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh" (3: 6), and "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 15: 50); "For the mind of the flesh is death" (Rom. 8: 6). "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," and "the mind of the spirit is life and peace."

Life in the language of Scripture signifies not bare existence. In that sense life is the portion of all mankind, for no theory of annihilation or conditional immortality finds support in the Word.<sup>1</sup> Man is by nature immortal. Life in the natural sense is conscious existence; life in the ethical sense is conscious existence after the likeness of God, in whose image we were made. That alone is life in man which answers the end of his creation. It involves fellowship with God, the complete development and unfettered play of all his powers, holiness, blessedness, the perfect reflection of the divine nature. It is begun here and consummated hereafter. In the heavenly kingdom the believer shall be with Christ and be like Christ, and that is life in the highest form possible to man. He shall see His glory and share His glory, for he shall be like Him when he shall see Him as He is (1

<sup>1</sup> See Salmond's *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Bk. VI ch. 2.

John 3: 2). To this may be added what is said of heaven in the closing pages of chapter 5.

As life is not bare existence, death is not merely the cessation of existence. He is dead whose life does not answer the end of his creation. He does not cease to be, but he ceases to be *himself*, according to the divine purpose. Life is of God alone, and is imparted to men through His Son. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves" (6: 53). "God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life ; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life" (1 John 5: 11, 12). If any man is not in Christ, he is dead already. All life is of God, in whom alone we live and move and have our being; *spiritual* life is of God through conscious and voluntary fellowship with Him.

Yet the death of the wicked, as the life of the righteous, finds its consummation hereafter, and may therefore be represented as future; especially as the way of escape lies open during the present life, and destiny is not finally determined until the hour of death. It is possible to pass from death to life. Death is not the final state of any until the judgment is pronounced. "If a man keep my word, he shall never see death" (8: 51). In the Revelation, and there alone, the striking phrase, *second death*, is employed to de-

scribe the final state of the ungodly (2: 11; 20: 6; 21: 8). The terms used elsewhere in the New Testament, *eternal death*, *eternal punishment*, *eternal sin* (Mark 3: 29, true text), *eternal destruction*, *eternal judgment*, are not found in the Gospel or Epistles of John. The *doctrine*, however, is clearly taught. "Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (3: 3); "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (3: 36). These passages and others previously cited plainly and emphatically declare the total and final exclusion of the wicked from the kingdom of God. Nowhere is the hope held out of a place of repentance beyond the grave. Character is formed and destiny is fixed in the present life. Here the opportunity is given to repent and find forgiveness; beyond, there is a great gulf fixed between the abode of the righteous and the abode of the wicked, which none may cross (Luke 16: 26.)

It is charged indeed that we abridge the merits of Christ's atonement and limit the power of His Spirit if we deny the ultimate salvation of all mankind. But to impeach His word is not the way to do Him honor. He alone knows how far the benefits of His sacrifice extend, and He has plainly and repeatedly declared that there are those whose portion is eternal death. This ap-

pears to have been the common belief of the Jews (see Schürer, *Hist. Jew. People*, II, 2, p. 183, Hastings' B. D., Art. *Hell*), and He not only did not contradict it, but affirmed it in the most emphatic terms. It is inconceivable that in a matter of such moment He should suffer them to continue in error, and even use language which must confirm them in it. We know nothing of the future beyond what He has taught us Life and death hang upon His word. Apart from Him we have no promise of life, no hope of salvation. It is perilous to tamper with His word, for if His teaching is not trustworthy, we are in total ignorance of the world to come; and no fair interpretation of it can yield the doctrine of the universal salvation of the race. In the same breath He spoke of eternal life and eternal punishment. To deny the one is to invalidate the other, for they rest upon the same authority. And it must be remarked further that the doctrine of universalism is based in large measure upon the assumption, tacit or expressed, that God *owes* salvation to men, and is unjust if He withholds it from them, that He is bound to save them if He can. It is on the contrary the uniform and emphatic teaching of Scripture that God owes men nothing but condemnation for their sins, that salvation is of grace alone, and that it is His of right to determine how far His mercy shall extend.

It is not by arbitrary decree of God that sin and death are joined together. Sin *is* death, as disease is death, death incipient, progressive, absolute. In the degree in which the soul is under the dominion of sin it is dead. And to say that a man may be saved while he continues in sin is to say that he may be rescued from drowning while he remains under water. If salvation were a mere change of place, there might appear to be ground to charge God with cruelty if any were left to perish. But salvation consists essentially in change of heart, and must God change a man's heart against his will? If the sinner is answerable for his sin, he is responsible for his condemnation. To the challenge of the Almighty, "Wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayest be justified?" (Job 40: 8), there is no answer but that of David, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done that which is evil in thy sight; that thou mayest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest" (Ps. 51: 4).

It is an awful thought that there shall be souls forever lost. If it rest heavily upon our hearts, how must it have pressed upon the heart of Him who wept over Jerusalem and suffered on the cross? Who can tell what part it may have played in the anguish of Gethsemane and the darkness of Calvary? But while we must beware of enlarging the boundaries of the kingdom

of grace beyond the limits which He has described, we must beware on the other hand of restricting them too narrowly. The term *elect* does not signify that few shall be saved, that the gospel is a lifeboat that rescues a soul here and there while the mass of mankind is left to perish. It is, on the contrary, the uniform teaching of Scripture that the race which fell in Adam shall be redeemed in Christ. It is not inconsistent even with the more rigid forms of Calvinism to believe that the saved shall form the vast majority of mankind. Dr. Charles Hodge expressed his conviction that the number of the lost shall be to the number of the saved as the inmates of penitentiaries and jails to the free citizens of the state. Dr. A. A. Hodge teaches "that the multitude of the redeemed will be incomparably greater than the number of the lost. My father, at the close of his long life spent in the defense of Calvinism, wrote on one of his conference papers, in trembling characters, a little while before he died, 'I am fully persuaded that the vast majority of the human race will share in the beatitudes and glories of our Lord's redemption'" (*Pop. Lects. on Theol. Themes*, p. 460). Dr. Shedd held that "Compared with heaven, hell is narrow and limited. Sin is a speck upon the infinite azure of eternity, a spot on the sun. Hell is only a corner of the universe" (quoted from the *Presbyterian Review* for Oct., 1886, p. 762). Professor

Warfield speaks of the "relatively insignificant body of the lost" (Hastings' B. D., Art. *Predes-tination*, Vol. 4, p. 63). It is impossible to give the Scripture evidence in detail, but a few of the more noteworthy passages may be cited. Those who die in infancy constitute a vast proportion of the race, perhaps one-half, and as we have seen there is reason to believe that they are all made heirs of heaven. The promise that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head signifies that mankind, through Christ their leader and representative, shall triumph over Satan. God made His covenant with Abraham that in him should all the families of the earth be blessed, and promised that his seed should be as the dust of the earth, and as the stars of heaven (Gen. 12: 3; 13: 16; 15: 5); and the promise is fulfilled, as Paul teaches, in his spiritual posterity: "If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise" (Gal. 3: 29). The prophets paint the triumphs of the Messiah's kingdom in glowing colors. "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Is. 11: 9). "The root of Jesse . . . unto him shall the nations seek" (Is. 11: 10). "It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation"

unto the end of the earth" (Is. 49: 6). Ezekiel saw the river of salvation take its way from the house of God even to the Dead Sea, and "everything shall live whithersoever the river cometh" (47: 9). The Spirit of God shall be poured out on all flesh (Joel 2: 28). See also Jeremiah 16: 19; Micah 4; Mal. 1: 11. Christ declared, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself" (12: 32). In the visions of the seer of Patmos heaven is not represented as thinly peopled, with a few lonely souls flitting about through the infinite spaces. It is thronged with a multitude that no man can number, out of every nation, and of all tribes, and peoples, and tongues. Over against this uniform witness of the Word we cannot set sayings of local and temporary application, like the reference to the strait gate and the narrow way in Matt. 7: 13, 14. There are eddies in the stream, but the current holds on its way with ever increasing volume and power towards the sea of glory that shall overspread the earth. Throughout the Scripture from Genesis to Revelation it is affirmed that in the battle which began in Eden not Satan but God shall triumph. His purpose shall prevail, His salvation shall be accomplished. Christ shall see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied. And though one corner of the creation must remain forever dark, a perpetual exhibition of divine justice, Paul's prophecy of the restored uni-

verse shall be fulfilled. To Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess Him Lord, to the glory of God the Father, and God shall be all in all.

## XII

### JOHN AND PAUL COMPARED

THE student finds no task more alluring and more difficult than the attempt to discriminate between the various types of doctrine which the New Testament presents. "We know in part." No man sees all the truth, as no man embraces the horizon in a single glance. The sweep of the eye is not a circle but an arc. Conceptions of truth are shaped and colored by temperament and experience. We see what we were born to see, what we were trained to see. To see things as they are is a rare achievement ; for the eyes are windows, and the soul looks out of them through tinted glasses of prejudice, of passion, of desire, of hope and fear. No mind is a perfect medium, and allowance must always be made for the personal equation.

Four Gospels are required to give an adequate representation of the person of Christ ; four types of doctrine are required to exhibit the fulness of grace and truth in Him. They bear the names of Peter, Paul, James, and John, and are nearly related to the Gospels ; for tradition associates James with Matthew, Mark with Peter, and Luke

with Paul ; and in each case evangelist and apostle are in close accord in doctrine and in spirit. Of these the systems of Paul and John are by far the most extensive and important. Agreeing in substance they are widely contrasted in form, for each reflects the character, the training, the experience of the author.

Paul and John are distinguished in several respects.

(a) In natural temperament. Paul was both thinker and actor, as few men have been. When the church was about to enter upon a world-wide ministry, a leader was required. But where should one be found adequate to so great a task ? Not among the twelve, for none of them possessed the qualifications that the times demanded. A man was needed who should combine the energy of Peter and the mind of John. To find him Christ crossed over to the ranks of His enemies, and took their champion, and transformed him from a persecutor to an apostle. He fulfilled a world-wide ministry, and in labors was more abundant than all the twelve ; while his Epistles are unsurpassed in spiritual discernment and intellectual power. John was capable of sudden bursts of vehemence, such as flames out in the Revelation, and won for him the title, son of thunder ; but his was the energy rather of speech than of action. In the Acts he yielded the first place to Peter, then to Paul. Though

at times action might be forced upon him, he was by nature inclined to meditation.

Paul's Epistles are occasional, a by-product of his intense activity, reflect the circumstances of writer and readers. The Revelation and the smaller Epistles of John show that he was not blind to present needs and conditions, but he preferred to present truth rather in its abstract and enduring form. While he was musing, the fire burned; then spake he with his tongue (Ps 39: 3). The Epistles of Paul reflect every changing emotion of his soul, John abides rather in the eternal order. No man ever wrote of himself more fully and constantly than Paul, while yet no man is less open to the charge of egotism. The story of his life may be traced in his letters. John on the other hand gives us scarcely a hint of the events that marked his long career, and when he strikes the personal note it is the inner world of conviction and feeling to which he refers. His writings tell us almost nothing of the life that was prolonged to the close of the century.

Paul is a logician, John a seer. The distinction is illustrated by their use of language. Illative particles abound in the writings of Paul, while they are comparatively rare in John. The disproportion indeed is sometimes exaggerated. Godet remarks that of Greek particles John uses only δέ, καὶ, οὐν, ὡς and καθὼς, ἵνα and μέν (*Comm.*

on John, Introd. II, 2, § 3). The fact is that John uses no less than thirty-six in his Gospel, and *μέν* instead of occurring only once, as Godet says, is found eight times. Paul makes use of fifty-one, so that the total number is proportionately larger in John, since the length of his Gospel is less than half that of the Epistles of Paul. The evangelist uses eight that are not found in Paul—*ἡπερ*, *κατοίγε*, *δύεν*, *οὐκοῦν*, *πόθεν*, *πότερον*, *ποῦ*, *πρίν*, of which *ἡπερ* and *οὐκοῦν* are peculiar to John: while Paul uses nineteen that are not found in the Gospel. But while the difference in number is not great, they are far more frequently employed by Paul. His argument is bound together by these links of logic, while John constantly strings together clauses and sentences without connective particles, and the sequence of thought is left to the sympathetic interpretation of the reader (Winer, *N. T. Grammar*, § 60).

The difference is illustrated again by their mode of controversy. Paul overwhelms his opponents with arguments drawn from a wide range of thought, from nature, reason, experience, Scripture. John over against error pronounces the truth as an oracle, and relies upon its self-evidencing power. We are impressed by the calm confidence with which he speaks in his Second and Third Epistles as one entitled and accustomed to obedience, though he terms himself only presbyter; while Paul insists vehemently upon

his apostolic dignity and authority. This was due in part to the fact that Paul's position was assailed and John's assured, but in part also to the difference in character and training.

(b) In education. John was unlearned and ignorant (Acts 4: 13), unlettered and uncultured, with no education beyond that which the schools of a Galilean village might afford. Paul was reared in Tarsus, a city famed for Greek culture and learning. That he was proficient in classic lore there is no reason to believe. No inference can be drawn from a few quotations, which may have been in common use. His Pharisaic strictness and his early education in Jerusalem are against the probability of an extensive acquaintance with Greek literature, and there is no evidence of it in his writings. It is said, indeed, that with his quick, receptive mind, knowing that his mission was to the Gentiles, he could not have failed after his conversion to acquaint himself with the poets and philosophers from whom their conceptions of religion were derived. But if he felt the need of acquiring this knowledge, it is strange that he felt no need of using it. The man who could move among the noblest works of nature, the proudest monuments of art, the most famous scenes of history, and vouchsafe them not a word, was not likely to lay stress upon the value of secular learning. His style was not formed upon classic models, and his quo-

tations from profane authors are only three in number, while his pages are strewn with citations from the Old Testament. To what extent he was acquainted with Greek learning is a question we cannot answer ; that it exercised no considerable influence upon his thought is clear.

There is knowledge beyond that drawn from books, and the education that comes from travel, from wide acquaintance with men, from varied experience, was his. Born a Roman citizen, he was not ignorant of Roman law ; brought up in a Greek city, he was familiar with Greek customs.

But his main education was that which he received in the law of God, first at home, and subsequently at the feet of Gamaliel, a man of broad learning and liberal spirit. There he was instructed from boyhood in the wisdom of the schools, trained in the methods of Rabbinic logic and exegesis, which he afterwards wielded so effectively against his opponents. Whatever his knowledge of Greek letters may have been, he remained a Hebrew of the Hebrews, of the strictest sect of the Pharisees, advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of his own age among his countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of his fathers (Gal. 1 : 14) ; while the knowledge of the Scripture became part of his nature. As a Christian, with the same singleness of purpose, he determined to know noth-

## 372 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

ing but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. The form in which he presented the truth of the gospel was largely determined by his Pharisaic and Rabbinic training.

(c) In religious experience. John was a disciple of Christ throughout His ministry, and as His cousin was perhaps acquainted with Him from childhood; Paul caught a fleeting glimpse of Him after His ascension. John's vision of Him was reckoned by years, Paul's by moments. John knew Him as a man, then as the Son of God; as humbled, then as exalted: Paul saw Him only as the risen and glorified Redeemer. It was natural therefore that Paul should refuse to know Him after the flesh (2 Cor. 5: 16), while John regarded the confession that He is come in the flesh as the mark of discipleship (1 John 4: 2, 3; 2 John 7). It is true, of course, that the expression of Paul is equivalent to *judging according to appearance* (7: 24), but the phrase is one that would not occur to John. It must also be remembered that Paul's controversy was with the Jews, who denied the divinity of Jesus, and John's with the gnostics, who denied His humanity.

John's religious experience was one of gradual and continuous development, Paul's was one of sudden and radical revolution. He was like one born out of due time, so strange and abnormal was his conversion (1 Cor. 15: 8). With

John there was no such breach between the old life and the new. He grew into the kingdom of God by slow degrees; Paul was instantly and violently translated. John had never borne the Pharisaic yoke from which Paul escaped. His conception of the law was therefore different. Once only does he pass judgment upon it—"The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (1 : 17). Elsewhere he refers to it only as a historical fact. This was due in part to that natural temperament which inclined him to dwell rather upon essential principles than upon the temporary forms in which they might appear, and in part to circumstances. When his Gospel was written, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the wide extension of Christianity, the church confronted new errors, new conditions, new problems. Questions regarding the Mosaic law, so prominent in the days of Paul, had lost their importance, for the providence of God had returned a decisive answer. The conflict between Christianity and Judaism had given place to the larger conflict between Christianity and the world. He regarded the law as provisional and imperfect, but nowhere dwells upon the burden and bondage of it like Paul. To him the commandments were not grievous (1 John 5 : 3), because he had never given himself with the fiery energy of Paul to the task of winning salvation by them. To him the law, spiritualized by the teaching and

example of Christ, was the rule of life ; obedience was not the condition but the evidence of salvation. Christ does not command, Obey and live, but Live and obey. He had never, like Paul, invoked the law against the gospel, had never made the quick transition from the righteousness of the law to the righteousness of faith ; and he conceived no such relation of antagonism between them. The law, as Paul had tried it, as his enemies insisted, was the condition of salvation ; but no such thought of it lay in the mind of John ; or if at first he shared the common opinion of the time, it melted away insensibly under the teaching of his Master.

These differences in temperament, education, experience, serve to explain the difference in their mode of presenting truth. There is no reason to believe that the doctrine of John was appreciably affected by the teaching of Paul, as is sometimes asserted. (See McGiffert's *Apostolic Age* 5 : 4. "It was, at any rate, under the indirect influence of Paul that the discourses of the fourth Gospel were composed." Yet "His system was evidently not merely a development of Paul's. It had, in fact, another basis, and Paul's influence was but secondary." See also Bacon's *Introd. to N. T.*, ch. 11.) It is antecedently improbable, and there is no evidence, historical or internal, to sustain it. In all literature there is no style of thought or expression more thoroughly individ-

ual than that which John presents. Their teaching is in substance the same, but different in form. The Old Testament is to both the presupposition of the New. The gospel is the fulfilment of the law; accomplished the purpose which the law had in view, but was not designed to effect.

Especially close is the resemblance between them in the great doctrine of salvation, with the poles upon which it turns—Christ the Savior, faith the condition of salvation. Christ is God's word to man, faith is man's response to God.

*The Person of Christ.*—Both set forth in the strongest terms His divinity, represent Him as the sole and sufficient Savior. Both emphasize beyond any other writing of the New Testament, except the Epistle to the Hebrews, His preexistence.

Yet here too differences appear.

(a) The office of Christ in His preexistent state is more definitely brought out by John. Paul refers to it to magnify His condescension (Phil. 2), or to indicate His qualification for the work of Redeemer (Col. 1). He teaches indeed that God is made known in His works, His providence, the Old Testament, and that Christ in all these is the medium of revelation. But he treats of the preexistence of Christ with more exclusive reference to the incarnation and the atonement, while John recognizes His mediatorial office from the

## 376 The Teaching of the Gospel of John

beginning, the office of revelation, culminating in His assuming the form of man. Yet it should be observed that only in the prologue of the Gospel does John distinctly announce this truth. For him, too, the revelation of grace is far higher than the revelation of nature.

(b) John emphasizes rather the *person*, and Paul the *work* of Christ. *Christ died for us* is the central thought of the Epistles, *I am* is the dominant note of the Gospel. The cross which Paul put in the forefront of his teaching is nowhere named by John except in his portrayal of the crucifixion. John had companioned with Jesus throughout His ministry, and His life and death appeared to him parts of one work, one sacrifice. Paul, who regarded His life, as it were, from a single point of view, seized upon the salient facts of His death and resurrection. He who has traversed the road step by step finds the whole course of it impressed upon his memory, while he who has only looked upon it from a distance recalls merely the outstanding features, and long stretches are forgotten. Paul's interest in the life of Christ was concentrated upon His death and resurrection. All else was viewed in its relation to the atonement, and references to His life, His teaching, His works, are casual and rare. He died for our sins according to the Scriptures ; the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, is his summary of the gospel (1 Cor.

15:1-4). *Christ crucified* was the theme of Paul's preaching; *Christ come in the flesh* is the characteristic thought of John. John magnified the life, Paul the death; John the incarnation, Paul the atonement. It is the work of Christ *for* man on which Paul insists; the work of Christ *in* man upon which John delights to dwell. Thus Paul emphasizes the relation of the death of Christ to the justice of God; John, its relation to the needs of men. With Paul His death was the offering of Himself to God; with John, the gift of Himself to men.

It is not strictly true, as Weiss asserts, that "the sending of the only begotten Son is never by John, as with Paul, put in the point of view of a humiliation" (*Bib. Theol. N. T.*, § 145 [c]). The thought of humiliation is at least clearly suggested. The glory which He had with the Father before the world was He laid aside for a time (7:39—"Jesus was not yet glorified"), to be resumed at His ascension (17:1, 5). Yet it is true that John does not sharply distinguish between the humiliation and the exaltation of Christ. With Paul the incarnation is the veiling of the divine glory, with John it is rather the manifestation of that glory. The death of Christ was to Paul the lowest depth of His humiliation, to John it was the first step in His exaltation (12:23). The glory of God, else "dark with excess of light," was so far veiled by the

flesh that men might behold Him who is invisible. The light is tempered to the eye. In the incarnation God is at once hidden and revealed: hidden, because His essential glory is obscured; revealed, because He assumes the form in which He may be most easily apprehended. He is hidden that He may be revealed, as the sun is observed through colored glasses, which darken its radiance to render it tolerable to the sight. It must not be forgotten that these distinctions are relative, not absolute. The difference is one not of substance, but of emphasis and proportion. Paul and John teach the same truth, but they present it in different aspects and relations.

*The Doctrine of Faith.*—Salvation is of grace upon the side of God, of faith upon the side of man. Grace is the cause, faith the condition of salvation. We have already seen (ch. 8) that the conception of John as the apostle of love is drawn from his Epistles. Throughout the Gospel faith holds the foremost place. And with Paul and John alike faith is not intellectual merely, but vital, not assent to a truth, but trust in a person. The believer's mystical union, oneness of life, with Christ through faith is conspicuous in both, essential to the gospel that they preach. The death and resurrection of Christ have no value for us unless by faith we die and rise with Him; His life no value, unless it be made ours by faith. The difference

between them here is that with Paul the object of faith is more distinctively Christ *crucified*. With both faith is intensely personal, and Christ is the object of it; but Paul discriminates more sharply, and enjoins faith in Christ *as a sacrifice*. This springs of course from the difference in their relation to Him which has already been treated.

Paul presents the outer and forensic aspect of salvation, while John presents the inner and vital aspect of it. The words *justify*, *justification*, which are cardinal terms in Paul's theology, are nowhere found in John. Justification is not with Paul, as is sometimes represented, a legal fiction, but a legal fact. God must *count* man righteous before He can *make* man righteous. The curse must be lifted before the blessing is imparted. But with this side of the truth John is not concerned. Paul magnifies the pardon of sin, John the gift of life. *Righteousness* rarely occurs in his writings, and never in the forensic or judicial sense. It is never represented as imputed. In the Gospel it is found only in 16:8, 10—"And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; . . . of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more;" and in the Epistles only in the phrase *doing righteousness* (1 John 2:29; 3:7, 10). With Paul salvation is the *righteousness* of Christ *imputed*; with

John it is the *life* of Christ *imparted*. Paul teaches that we are saved by the application of His atonement, John by the appropriation of His life. Paul represents salvation in terms of law, John in terms of life.

With Paul men become sons of God by adoption, with John by regeneration. The thought of regeneration of course is not strange to the apostle of the Gentiles. He often suggests it, and speaks of it explicitly in Titus 3:5. But the thought of adoption is peculiar to Paul. Other New Testament writers dwell upon the new birth. The outward and formal relation is indicated by Paul alone. He appears to be conscious of no incongruity in representing believers as children of God both by birth and by adoption.

It is further true that Paul discovers the ground of salvation rather in the *will*, the good pleasure, and John in the *nature* of God. Of course to Paul the will of God is the expression of his nature, but he does not explicitly and constantly trace salvation to its source in the divine nature as light and love like John. It is not too much to say, indeed, that Paul occasionally climbs the heights where John habitually dwells.

John represents truth rather in its essence, and Paul in its application. The writings of Paul therefore exhibit far greater variety. Compare 1 Corinthians and 1 John. The vocabulary of John is meagre. Matthew uses 1,542 words,

Mark 1,259, Luke 2,697, Paul 2,446, the Epistle to the Hebrews 984, and John in Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse 1,396, of which only 922 are found in the Gospel. In proportion to the extent of his writings, his vocabulary is the most limited that the New Testament presents. This is due of course to the frequent recurrence of favorite thoughts and phrases. (See my article, *Vocabulary of the New Testament—Pres. and Ref. Review*, Oct., 1891.) A few great words continually recur, because he pierced to the heart of the truth, and found the central unity. Truth is simple in its essence, manifold in its application. The occasional letters of John are brief and hasty, but he loved to linger over profound truth, repeat it in various forms, turn it from side to side, to catch the light that shines from every aspect of it.

Paul therefore, though not less *profoundly* spiritual is less *exclusively* spiritual than John. He was keenly alive to all that was about him, interested in every phase of thought and life; John had his eye fixed upon the eternal order of the universe, and the world appeared to him a passing show. The plans and purposes of men are ripples that play upon the surface of the stream; the will of God is the current that pushes on its stedfast way.

John regards rather the ideal, Paul the actual; Paul the process, John the result. The

believer *should not sin*—says Paul; the believer *cannot sin*, says John. The believer *hath, shall have*, eternal life. John, indeed, recognizes the future consummation, and Paul looks to the end from the beginning; but in general the distinction holds. Paul has his eye upon the present scene of struggle, John regards the inevitable end.

John brings us nearer if not to the substance yet to the form of our Lord's teaching. Paul was trained in the school of Gamaliel, John in the school of Christ. And though both enjoyed the guidance of the Spirit, the difference in training appears. It is certainly possible that John has cast the teaching of Jesus in the mould of his own thought, so that the form of it is due to the evangelist. But is it not more reasonable to suppose that the style of John is framed upon that of his Master? This style of mingled grace and majesty was the manner of the Lord Himself. That the Apocalypse was written in the closing years of the century is a fact abundantly attested, to which modern criticism is beginning to return after long wandering in the wilderness in search of Nero Redivivus. This is indeed one of the most notable reactions in the history of New Testament interpretation. (See Hastings' B. D., Art. *Revelation*, Vol. 4, p. 259.) Among recent writers who accept the late date may be named Harnack, Zahn, Krüger, McGiffert, Ramsay and Bacon.

If within so short a space John could write books so dissimilar in style and matter as the Gospel and the Apocalypse, it is not too much to believe that Jesus spoke to the multitude in the manner of the Synoptists, and to the disciples in the manner of John. The argument is valid of course only for those who attribute both the Gospel and the Revelation to the Apostle. Even if the composite character of the Apocalypse should be established, its unity is so manifest that we may speak of it with propriety as the work of John. From whatever sources the materials have been gathered they have been woven together by a single hand.

Protestant theology is built too exclusively upon the logic of Paul. It is easier, indeed, to apprehend his reasoning than to enter into the tender mysticism of the beloved disciple, easier to think with him than to feel with John. The writings of John, omitting the Revelation, are about one-half as large as the Epistles of Paul, but no such proportion is observed in our systems. It is true that the writings of Paul yield themselves more readily to systematic treatment, but the elements which John supplies are those in which theology is weak. Our conceptions are largely formal, forensic. There is danger that we rest upon the outer aspects of the truth that Paul teaches without penetrating to the heart of it. It is just because John presents the truth in its

essential and eternal nature, divorced from all that is occasional and temporal, that the study of his writings will preserve us from that formalism against which Paul so earnestly contended, but which through a false interpretation of his teaching has often found its way into the Christian church. If the heart makes the theologian, John is entitled to this name given him by the ancient church. It is evident that the distinction between John and Paul is in great measure that which appears between the early Greek and Latin theologians.

No system of theology can be termed complete which does not embrace the various types of doctrine substantially in the proportion which they hold in the New Testament. With Paul the forms in which the truth is cast were intensely real. There was to him no conflict between form and substance. To us there may be, for the forms which in one age are living in the next are dead. Salvation is legal and vital. Both aspects of it are presented by Paul, but the legal is so conspicuous, so much more easily apprehended, that thought may rest upon it. The Fatherhood of God, the distinctive truth of New Testament theology, may be overshadowed by his moral government; the processes of life may be hidden by the forms of law; salvation may be reduced to a commercial transaction, so much suffering paid for so much sin; may be represented as the par-

don of sin, but not as the gift of life. All these perversions have sprung from seizing upon those formal aspects of Paul's teaching which lie upon the surface, and overlooking the truth that the form embodies. This tendency the teaching of John corrects. That too may be abused, but not in the same way. Mysticism has its errors and its perils as well as scholasticism, but they are of a different nature. The systems of Paul and John are complementary. Each serves to guard the other from abuse, and both are needful for the full exhibition of the truth as it is in Jesus.



# Index of Texts

(Passages discussed are marked with \*)

<i>Genesis</i>	<i>PAGE</i>	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
I . . . . .	87	I: 31 . . . . .	73
I: 2 . . . . .	157	8: 5 . . . . .	73
I: 27 . . . . .	103	14: 1, 2 . . . . .	73
3 . . . . .	197	30: 1-3 . . . . .	59
3: 15 . . . . .	119, 198	32: 6 . . . . .	73
4: 26 . . . . .	259	32: 8 . . . . .	60
6: 2 . . . . .	196*		
6: 3 . . . . .	107, 157, 219		
12: 3 . . . . .	363		
13: 16 . . . . .	363		
15: 5 . . . . .	363		
15: 6 . . . . .	52, 249		
16: 7, 13 . . . . .	88		
41: 38 . . . . .	157		
48: 15, 16 . . . . .	88		
<i>Exodus</i>		<i>Judges</i>	
3: 2, 4, 6 . . . . .	88	3: 10 . . . . .	157
3: 13 . . . . .	131	6: 34 . . . . .	157
3: 14 . . . . .	99, 131*	11: 29 . . . . .	157
4: 22 . . . . .	73	13: 25 . . . . .	157
7: 22 . . . . .	219	14: 6, 19 . . . . .	157
8: 15, 32 . . . . .	219	15: 14 . . . . .	157
10: 20, 27 . . . . .	219		
12: 46 . . . . .	48		
31: 3 . . . . .	157		
33: 18 . . . . .	111		
33: 23 . . . . .	52, 111		
35: 51 . . . . .	157		
<i>Numbers</i>		<i>I. Samuel</i>	
9: 12 . . . . .	48	10: 6, 10 . . . . .	157
11: 17, 25, 26, 29 . . . . .	157	11: 6 . . . . .	157
24: 2 . . . . .	157	15: 22 . . . . .	31
27: 18 . . . . .	157	16: 13 . . . . .	157
<i>II. Samuel</i>		<i>II. Kings</i>	
		7: 14 . . . . .	74, 127
<i>I. Kings</i>		8: 30ff. . . . .	62
<i>I. Chronicles</i>			
		12: 18 . . . . .	157
<i>II. Chronicles</i>			
		6: 12ff. . . . .	59
		6: 18 . . . . .	60

## Index of Texts

<i>Job</i>	PAGE	<i>Proverbs</i>	PAGE
1: 9-11 . . . . .	197	1: 23 . . . . .	158
2: 4, 5 . . . . .	197	3: 18, 19 . . . . .	88
26: 13 . . . . .	157	8: 14, 22, 23, 30, 31, 35,	
28 . . . . .	87	36 . . . . .	88
31: 33 . . . . .	190*	16: 4 . . . . .	185*
33: 4 . . . . .	157	18: 4 . . . . .	48
40: 8 . . . . .	361	30: 4 . . . . .	88
42: 5, 6 . . . . .	123		
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>			
	7: 29 . . . . .		189
<i>Psalms</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
2: 7 . . . . .	127	1: 10-17 . . . . .	31
8: 4 . . . . .	122	2: 1 . . . . .	87
8: 5 . . . . .	112	5 . . . . .	257
11: 4 . . . . .	62	6 . . . . .	111
16: 10 . . . . .	49	6: 5 . . . . .	123
19 . . . . .	136	6: 10 . . . . .	47, 49
19: 7-11 . . . . .	87	7: 9 . . . . .	52
22: 18 . . . . .	48	8: 20 . . . . .	171
33: 6 . . . . .	87	11: 1 . . . . .	158
34: 20 . . . . .	48, 233	11: 3 . . . . .	346
35: 19 . . . . .	48	11: 9, 10 . . . . .	363
39: 3 . . . . .	368	14: 12 . . . . .	194
41: 9 . . . . .	47	32: 15 . . . . .	158
51 . . . . .	123	34: 16 . . . . .	157
51: 4 . . . . .	361	40 . . . . .	60
51: 5 . . . . .	211	40: 3 . . . . .	47
51: 10 . . . . .	236	40: 8 . . . . .	87
51: 11, 12 . . . . .	158	40: 12 . . . . .	157
69: 9 . . . . .	47	40: 18 . . . . .	54
69: 21 . . . . .	49	42: 1 . . . . .	158
73: 15 . . . . .	73	43: 27 . . . . .	190*
78: 24 . . . . .	47	45: 7 . . . . .	185*
81: 12 . . . . .	219	48: 16 . . . . .	181
82: 6 . . . . .	47, 129	49: 6 . . . . .	364
90: 2 . . . . .	94	53 . . . . .	89, 232, 233
103: 19 . . . . .	62	53: 1 . . . . .	47
104 . . . . .	157	54: 13 . . . . .	47, 226
109: 8 . . . . .	49	55: 11 . . . . .	87, 136
118: 25, 26 . . . . .	49	57: 15 . . . . .	62, 254
119 . . . . .	136	58: 11 . . . . .	48
119: 89, 105, 130 . . . . .	87	59: 21 . . . . .	158
130: 3 . . . . .	123	61 . . . . .	158
136: 5 . . . . .	88	63: 9 . . . . .	88, 147
138: 2 . . . . .	89	63: 10, 11, 14 . . . . .	157
139: 7 . . . . .	60, 157		
143: 10 . . . . .			

# Index of Texts

389

<i>Isaiah</i>	PAGE	<i>Habakkuk</i>	PAGE
63: 16 . . . . .	74	2: 4 . . . . .	52
64: 6 . . . . .	123		
64: 8 . . . . .	73		
66: 1 . . . . .	62		
		<i>Haggai</i>	
		2: 5 . . . . .	157
<i>Jeremiah</i>		<i>Zechariah</i>	
1: 5 . . . . .	99	2: 8 . . . . .	147
7: 21-23 . . . . .	31	3: 1 . . . . .	197
10: 12 . . . . .	88	4: 6 . . . . .	157
16: 19 . . . . .	364	7: 12 . . . . .	157
23: 16 . . . . .	170	9: 9 . . . . .	47
23: 24 . . . . .	60	12: 10 . . . . .	48
31: 9 . . . . .	74	14: 8 . . . . .	48
51: 15 . . . . .	88		
		<i>Malachi</i>	
		1: 6 . . . . .	74, 79
<i>Ezekiel</i>		1: 11 . . . . .	32, 59, 364
16: 3 . . . . .	199	2: 10 . . . . .	74
36: 26 . . . . .	236	3: 1 . . . . .	88
36: 27 . . . . .	158		
37: 14 . . . . .	158		
39: 29 . . . . .	158		
47 . . . . .	49, 313	<i>Matthew</i>	
47: 9 . . . . .	364	3: 15 . . . . .	35, 310
		4: 11 . . . . .	117
<i>Daniel</i>		4: 12 . . . . .	26
7: 13 . . . . .	44, 118*	5: 17 . . . . .	35*
9 . . . . .	123	5: 22, 28 . . . . .	212
		5: 34 . . . . .	62
<i>Hosea</i>		5: 45 . . . . .	65
4: 17 . . . . .	219	6: 5 . . . . .	277
6: 7 . . . . .	190*	6: 13 . . . . .	198
11: 1 . . . . .	74	6: 23 . . . . .	209
		7: 13, 14 . . . . .	364
<i>Joel</i>		7: 21 . . . . .	347
2: 28 . . . . .	49, 364	9: 13 . . . . .	31
2: 28, 29 . . . . .	158	10: 28 . . . . .	340
		10: 34 . . . . .	349
<i>Amos</i>		11: 11 . . . . .	24
3: 6 . . . . .	185*	11: 25, 26 . . . . .	224
5: 21ff. . . . .	31	11: 25-30 . . . . .	9
		11: 27 . . . . .	93, 126
<i>Micah</i>		12: 1ff. . . . .	40
1: 1 . . . . .	87	12: 7 . . . . .	31
2: 7 . . . . .	157	12: 11 . . . . .	41
4 . . . . .	364	12: 12 . . . . .	40
6: 6ff. . . . .	31	12: 34 . . . . .	84
		12: 37 . . . . .	84, 352

## Index of Texts

*Matthew*

	PAGE		PAGE
13: 14 . . . . .	218	4: 12 . . . . .	50
13: 15 . . . . .	50	6: 1, 4 . . . . .	26*
13: 54 . . . . .	26	7: 3 . . . . .	29
15: 21 . . . . .	24	7: 8, 9 . . . . .	36
16: 18 . . . . .	290	7: 19 . . . . .	33
16: 19 . . . . .	298	7: 21 . . . . .	212
16: 22 . . . . .	170	7: 24, 31 . . . . .	24
16: 23 . . . . .	198	10: 45 . . . . .	232
16: 28 . . . . .	337	12: 30 . . . . .	81
18: 6 . . . . .	247	13: 6 . . . . .	350
18: 15 . . . . .	176	13: 32 . . . . .	126, 135,* 328
18: 17 . . . . .	290	14: 58 . . . . .	34
18: 17, 18 . . . . .	298	14: 61 . . . . .	126
19: 14 . . . . .	211	15: 10 . . . . .	30
20: 28 . . . . .	232	15: 11 . . . . .	31
22: 45 . . . . .	125	15: 29 . . . . .	34
23: 6 . . . . .	277	16: 12 . . . . .	146
23: 23 . . . . .	31	16: 16 . . . . .	239, 307
24: 5 . . . . .	350		
24: 9 . . . . .	338		
24: 14 . . . . .	150	Luke	
24: 24 . . . . .	350	1: 35 . . . . .	166
24: 27 . . . . .	325	2: 10 . . . . .	24
24: 30 . . . . .	119	2: 26 . . . . .	237
24: 36 . . . . .	126, 328	3: 19 . . . . .	176
25: 31ff. . . . .	344, 346, 351	3: 38 . . . . .	70
25: 34 . . . . .	153	4: 16 . . . . .	34
26: 13 . . . . .	150	4: 23, 24 . . . . .	26*
26: 55 . . . . .	34	5: 8 . . . . .	123
26: 59 . . . . .	33	6: 46 . . . . .	274
26: 61 . . . . .	34	7: 3 . . . . .	29
26: 63 . . . . .	126	8: 10 . . . . .	50
26: 64 . . . . .	119, 337	9: 31 . . . . .	53
26: 73 . . . . .	84	10: 15 . . . . .	193*
27: 20, 25 . . . . .	31	10: 18 . . . . .	179, 193*
27: 40 . . . . .	34	10: 21, 22 . . . . .	9
27: 42 . . . . .	247	10: 22 . . . . .	126
27: 62 . . . . .	30	10: 27 . . . . .	31
28: 12, 13 . . . . .	31	11: 43 . . . . .	277
28: 15 . . . . .	29	11: 49 . . . . .	88*
28: 19 . . . . .	126, 307	13: 1-5 . . . . .	217
		13: 15 . . . . .	41
		13: 23, 24 . . . . .	353
		13: 33, 34 . . . . .	27
		13: 34 . . . . .	66
		16: 19ff. . . . .	53
		16: 22, 23 . . . . .	100

*Mark*

1: 14 . . . . .	26
2: 23ff. . . . .	40
3: 29 . . . . .	359

# Index of Texts

391

## *Luke*

	PAGE
16: 25 . . . . .	154, 221
16: 26 . . . . .	359
18: 10-14 . . . . .	251
19: 42 . . . . .	50
22: 32 . . . . .	240
22: 43 . . . . .	117
22: 67-70 . . . . .	126
23: 5, 7 . . . . .	25
23: 43 . . . . .	344
23: 51 . . . . .	29
24: 33 . . . . .	298
24: 39 . . . . .	105, 146
24: 44 . . . . .	23
24: 49 . . . . .	307

## *John*

	PAGE
1: 1 . . . . .	57, 60
1: 3 . . . . .	94*
1: 4 . . . . .	94, 226, 252
1: 5 . . . . .	209*
1: 9 . . . . .	64, 82
1: 10 . . . . .	10, 215
1: 11 . . . . .	24, 28, 91,* 325
1: 12 . . . . .	76, 234, 246
1: 13 . . . . .	106, 237*
1: 14 . . . . .	69, 325
1: 17 . . . . .	23, 373
1: 18 . . . . .	52, 57, 62, 69, 93, 100, 101,* 134
1: 23 . . . . .	47
1: 29 . . . . .	43, 233,* 243
1: 30 . . . . .	97,* 106
1: 31 . . . . .	24, 310
1: 32 . . . . .	62, 167
1: 36 . . . . .	43
1: 45 . . . . .	42, 92
1: 45, 46 . . . . .	25
1: 46 . . . . .	45*
1: 47 . . . . .	24
1: 49 . . . . .	116
1: 51 . . . . .	23, 116, 117*
2: 12 . . . . .	25
2: 13 . . . . .	26
2: 17 . . . . .	47
2: 19 . . . . .	43, 232

## *John*

	PAGE
2: 19-21 . . . . .	10, 34*
2: 21 . . . . .	107
2: 22 . . . . .	49, 265, 266
2: 23 . . . . .	138
2: 23, 24 . . . . .	246
2: 24, 25 . . . . .	134
3: 2 . . . . .	45, 140
3: 3 . . . . .	221, 359
3: 3, 5 . . . . .	353
3: 5 . . . . .	76, 159, 221, 238*
3: 6 . . . . .	106, 159,* 357
3: 8 . . . . .	159, 236*
3: 10 . . . . .	236
3: 11, 12 . . . . .	134
3: 13 . . . . .	63, 97
3: 14 . . . . .	43, 232
3: 16 . . . . .	61, 65, 69, 225*
3: 17 . . . . .	114, 221, 348
3: 18 . . . . .	69, 210, 216
3: 18, 19 . . . . .	349
3: 19 . . . . .	207, 209, 277
3: 20 . . . . .	176
3: 21 . . . . .	61
3: 22 . . . . .	306
3: 23, 26 . . . . .	306
3: 27 . . . . .	62
3: 29 . . . . .	92
3: 31 . . . . .	97
3: 33 . . . . .	61
3: 34 . . . . .	167
3: 36 . . . . .	52, 70, 210, 237, 348, 359
4: 1 . . . . .	26
4: 2 . . . . .	306
4: 5 . . . . .	23
4: 9 . . . . .	24
4: 10ff. . . . .	11
4: 12 . . . . .	23
4: 14 . . . . .	49*
4: 21-24 . . . . .	127
4: 22 . . . . .	24, 29, 43, 221
4: 23 . . . . .	32,* 76*
4: 24 . . . . .	58*
4: 25 . . . . .	42
4: 34 . . . . .	112
4: 35 . . . . .	26, 38*

## Index of Texts

<i>John</i>	PAGE	<i>John</i>	PAGE
4: 40 . . . . .	25	6: 29 . . . . .	244, 351
4: 42 . . . . .	221	6: 31 . . . . .	47
4: 44 . . . . .	25*	6: 31ff. . . . .	43
4: 46 . . . . .	25	6: 32 . . . . .	23
4: 46ff. . . . .	139	6: 33 . . . . .	235
4: 48 . . . . .	140	6: 37 . . . . .	225, 226
5: 1 . . . . .	27,* 37*	6: 38 . . . . .	63, 112
5: 4 . . . . .	117*	6: 39, 40 . . . . .	341
5: 14 . . . . .	34, 42, 216, 244	6: 44 . . . . .	225, 352
5: 16ff. . . . .	39*	6: 45 . . . . .	23, 47, 61, 225, 226
5: 17 . . . . .	61	6: 46 . . . . .	134
5: 18 . . . . .	39	6: 47 . . . . .	235, 246
5: 18ff. . . . .	127*	6: 49 . . . . .	23
5: 19 . . . . .	112	6: 50 . . . . .	114
5: 21ff. . . . .	210, 326, 341*	6: 51 . . . . .	142, 231, 232, 235
5: 22 . . . . .	61, 65, 346	6: 51ff. . . . .	105
5: 23 . . . . .	116, 348	6: 53 . . . . .	358
5: 24 . . . . .	210, 223, 246, 343, 349	6: 54 . . . . .	223, 235, 341
5: 25 . . . . .	341	6: 57 . . . . .	223
5: 26 . . . . .	61, 223	6: 59 . . . . .	34
5: 27 . . . . .	61, 347*	6: 62 . . . . .	97
5: 28, 29 . . . . .	340, 351, 354, 356	6: 63 . . . . .	105, 136, 235, 273
5: 29 . . . . .	31	6: 65 . . . . .	225
5: 30 . . . . .	112, 170, 346	6: 68 . . . . .	136
5: 33-35 . . . . .	247	6: 69 . . . . .	116, 246
5: 34 . . . . .	221	6: 70 . . . . .	198
5: 36 . . . . .	112, 140, 247	7: 2 . . . . .	26
5: 37 . . . . .	247	7: 3, 4 . . . . .	25*
5: 38 . . . . .	28, 255	7: 7 . . . . .	284
5: 39 . . . . .	28, 42, 92, 137, 247	7: 14 . . . . .	34
5: 39, 40 . . . . .	243	7: 16 . . . . .	112
5: 40 . . . . .	28, 137	7: 17 . . . . .	81, 207, 242
5: 43 . . . . .	167	7: 18 . . . . .	112
5: 46 . . . . .	23, 36, 42, 46, 92	7: 19 . . . . .	23, 36
6 . . . . .	234,* 256*	7: 21 . . . . .	41*
6: 2 . . . . .	138	7: 22, 23 . . . . .	23
6: 4 . . . . .	38	7: 24 . . . . .	106, 372
6: 11 . . . . .	114	7: 27 . . . . .	44*
6: 14 . . . . .	43	7: 28 . . . . .	34
6: 15 . . . . .	46	7: 31 . . . . .	138, 246
6: 19 . . . . .	139	7: 35 . . . . .	320
6: 26 . . . . .	138, 140	7: 37 . . . . .	11
6: 27 . . . . .	241	7: 38 . . . . .	48*
		7: 38, 39 . . . . .	10
		7: 39 . . . . .	181, 377

# Index of Texts

393

<i>John</i>	PAGE	<i>John</i>	PAGE
7: 40 . . . . .	43	9: 3 . . . . .	61
7: 41 . . . . .	25, 43	9: 4 . . . . .	113
7: 41, 42 . . . . .	44	9: 5 . . . . .	11, 252
7: 51 . . . . .	36	9: 16 . . . . .	29
7: 52 . . . . .	25, 44	9: 17 . . . . .	43
8: 12 . . . . .	64, 114, 252	9: 28 . . . . .	28
8: 15 . . . . .	106,* 348	9: 29 . . . . .	23, 45
8: 15, 16 . . . . .	114	9: 33 . . . . .	140
8: 16 . . . . .	349	9: 39 . . . . .	114, 344, 349
8: 18 . . . . .	247	9: 41 . . . . .	123, 207
8: 19 . . . . .	116	10: 8 . . . . .	36*
8: 20 . . . . .	34	10: 9 . . . . .	221, 256
8: 23 . . . . .	28, 123	10: 10 . . . . .	114
8: 24 . . . . .	210, 357	10: 11 . . . . .	232, 235
8: 25 . . . . .	95*	10: 14, 15 . . . . .	243
8: 26 . . . . .	61, 170, 349	10: 15 . . . . .	107, 232, 235
8: 28 . . . . .	112, 179, 232	10: 16 . . . . .	33, 77, 235
8: 29 . . . . .	122	10: 17 . . . . .	113
8: 31 . . . . .	246, 255	10: 18 . . . . .	231
8: 32, 34 . . . . .	243	10: 21 . . . . .	140
8: 32-36 . . . . .	209	10: 22 . . . . .	26
8: 34 . . . . .	209, 228	10: 23 . . . . .	34
8: 35 . . . . .	123, 152	10: 24 . . . . .	128
8: 37 . . . . .	23, 28, 75, 255	10: 25 . . . . .	140, 247
8: 38 . . . . .	28, 123	10: 26 . . . . .	235
8: 39 . . . . .	28, 75	10: 27, 28 . . . . .	353
8: 39-44 . . . . .	352	10: 28, 29 . . . . .	286*
8: 40 . . . . .	28, 106, 112	10: 29 . . . . .	61, 102, 225
8: 41 . . . . .	28, 75	10: 30 . . . . .	103,* 128*
8: 42 . . . . .	75, 101*	10: 33 . . . . .	39
8: 43 . . . . .	84, 85*	10: 34 . . . . .	23, 47
8: 44 . . . . .	23, 75, 170, 194,* 196,* 197, 199,* 201*	10: 34-6 . . . . .	129*
8: 45 . . . . .	246	10: 35 . . . . .	10, 23, 51*
8: 46 . . . . .	75, 122, 177	10: 36 . . . . .	263
8: 47 . . . . .	28, 77, 81	10: 38 . . . . .	246
8: 48 . . . . .	25*	10: 39 . . . . .	26
8: 50 . . . . .	112, 346	10: 40 . . . . .	27, 306
8: 51 . . . . .	358	11: 4 . . . . .	61, 116
8: 53-58 . . . . .	11	11: 9, 10 . . . . .	209
8: 55 . . . . .	28, 242	11: 24 . . . . .	341
8: 56 . . . . .	46, 53,* 75, 92	11: 25 . . . . .	11, 252
8: 58 . . . . .	96, 99*	11: 27 . . . . .	43, 116
8: 59 . . . . .	34	11: 33 . . . . .	107
9: 2 . . . . .	192*	11: 40 . . . . .	61
9: 2, 3 . . . . .	217	11: 41 . . . . .	62, 113
		11: 42 . . . . .	148

## Index of Texts

<i>John</i>	PAGE	<i>John</i>	PAGE
11: 45 . . . . .	140	13: 27 . . . . .	197, 219
11: 49 . . . . .	30	13: 31, 32 . . . . .	113, 116, 235
11: 51, 52 . . . . .	77, 235	13: 33 . . . . .	29
11: 54 . . . . .	27	13: 35 . . . . .	275, 317
12: 9 . . . . .	31	13: 38 . . . . .	232
12: 13 . . . . .	43, 49, 116	14: 1 . . . . .	116
12: 15 . . . . .	47, 116	14: 2 . . . . .	62
12: 19 . . . . .	30	14: 2, 3 . . . . .	151
12: 20 . . . . .	25	14: 3 . . . . .	338
12: 23 . . . . .	377	14: 5 . . . . .	175
12: 24 . . . . .	232, 274	14: 6 . . . . .	11, 93, 252, 353
12: 26 . . . . .	124	14: 8 . . . . .	75, 175
12: 27 . . . . .	107	14: 9 . . . . .	116
12: 27, 28 . . . . .	114	14: 10 . . . . .	35, 166, 170
12: 28 . . . . .	61, 113	14: 10-12 . . . . .	115
12: 29 . . . . .	117	14: 12 . . . . .	140
12: 31 . . . . .	179, 194, 198, 203, 235	14: 13, 14 . . . . .	149, 259, 260
12: 32 . . . . .	10, 232, 235, 364	14: 15 . . . . .	276
12: 33 . . . . .	10	14: 16 . . . . .	148, 150, 168
12: 33, 34 . . . . .	45*	14: 16, 17 . . . . .	174
12: 34 . . . . .	23, 126	14: 17 . . . . .	242, 253, 255, 336
12: 35 . . . . .	209	14: 18 . . . . .	336
12: 36 . . . . .	82, 252	14: 19 . . . . .	252
12: 37 . . . . .	138	14: 19, 20 . . . . .	336
12: 38 . . . . .	47	14: 20 . . . . .	35
12: 40 . . . . .	47, 49,* 218*	14: 21 . . . . .	67, 82, 124
12: 41 . . . . .	46, 92, 111	14: 22 . . . . .	336
12: 42 . . . . .	29	14: 23 . . . . .	253, 336
12: 43 . . . . .	277	14: 26 . . . . .	151, 158, 159, 167, 168, 170, 266
12: 44, 45 . . . . .	116	14: 28 . . . . .	102, 175, 266
12: 46 . . . . .	93, 114, 209, 252	14: 30 . . . . .	122, 198, 201
12: 47 . . . . .	114, 177, 221, 348	15 . . . . .	257*
12: 48, 49 . . . . .	351	15: 1 . . . . .	273, 346
12: 49 . . . . .	170	15: 3 . . . . .	136, 174, 273
12: 49, 50 . . . . .	112	15: 5, 6 . . . . .	274
13: 1 . . . . .	28	15: 7 . . . . .	260
13: 2 . . . . .	197	15: 8 . . . . .	274
13: 3 . . . . .	102*	15: 9 . . . . .	276
13: 10 . . . . .	266	15: 9, 10 . . . . .	255
13: 13 . . . . .	116	15: 10 . . . . .	79, 124
13: 14 . . . . .	276	15: 11 . . . . .	275
13: 16 . . . . .	298	15: 12 . . . . .	276
13: 18 . . . . .	47	15: 13 . . . . .	232
13: 21 . . . . .	107	15: 13, 14 . . . . .	281
13: 23 . . . . .	100		

# Index of Texts

395

<i>John</i>	PAGE	<i>John</i>	PAGE
15: 13-15 . . . . .	253	17: 4 . . . . .	61, 124, 142,
15: 15 . . . . .	116		235, 321
15: 16 . . . . .	216, 227, 259,	17: 5 . . . . .	10, 60, 63, 96, 377
	260, 274	17: 6 . . . . .	28, 116, 225
15: 17 . . . . .	275	17: 8 . . . . .	163, 246
15: 19 . . . . .	215	17: 9 . . . . .	225
15: 20 . . . . .	116	17: 11 . . . . .	61, 116, 316
15: 21 . . . . .	259	17: 12 . . . . .	49, 116
15: 22 . . . . .	207	17: 14 . . . . .	123
15: 23, 24 . . . . .	116	17: 14, 17 . . . . .	136
15: 24 . . . . .	207	17: 15 . . . . .	198, 284
15: 25 . . . . .	23, 48	17: 16 . . . . .	123, 215
15: 26 . . . . .	158, 159, 163,* 168, 169	17: 17 . . . . .	51, 61, 82, 174, 273
15: 26, 27 . . . . .	180, 247	17: 18 . . . . .	284
16: 1 . . . . .	275	17: 19 . . . . .	123, 232, 263*
16: 2 . . . . .	238	17: 20-23 . . . . .	180, 316, 317
16: 3 . . . . .	116	17: 21-23 . . . . .	258
16: 4 . . . . .	275	17: 22 . . . . .	63
16: 7 . . . . .	62, 150, 158, 168, 174	17: 23 . . . . .	255
16: 7, 8 . . . . .	181	17: 24 . . . . .	63, 97, 313*
16: 8 . . . . .	159, 216, 379	17: 25 . . . . .	61, 242
16: 8-11 . . . . .	176*	18: 3 . . . . .	30
16: 8, 13, 14 . . . . .	158	18: 5, 7 . . . . .	25
16: 10 . . . . .	122, 379	18: 20 . . . . .	29, 34
16: 11 . . . . .	194, 198, 203	18: 28 . . . . .	33
16: 12 . . . . .	82, 175, 265	18: 35 . . . . .	24, 30
16: 12, 13 . . . . .	171	18: 36 . . . . .	29, 221
16: 13 . . . . .	158, 159, 166, 169, 170, 172	18: 37 . . . . .	77, 81, 114, 132, 344
16: 23 . . . . .	173,* 260	19: 6 . . . . .	30
16: 24 . . . . .	259, 260	19: 7 . . . . .	39, 43, 126
16: 25 . . . . .	171, 265, 266	19: 11 . . . . .	30, 208*
16: 26 . . . . .	148,* 173, 259, 260	19: 12 . . . . .	43, 46
16: 27 . . . . .	67, 102,* 163	19: 15 . . . . .	31
16: 28 . . . . .	63, 102,* 339	19: 19 . . . . .	24, 25
16: 30 . . . . .	102*	19: 24 . . . . .	48
16: 30, 31 . . . . .	266	19: 28 . . . . .	49
16: 31 . . . . .	175	19: 30 . . . . .	107, 142
16: 33 . . . . .	268, 275, 284	19: 31 . . . . .	33
17 . . . . .	280*	19: 34-37 . . . . .	309*
17: 1 . . . . .	61, 62, 113, 377	19: 36 . . . . .	48, 233
17: 2 . . . . .	106, 225*	19: 37 . . . . .	48
17: 3 . . . . .	59, 61, 241	19: 38 . . . . .	107
		19: 40 . . . . .	24
		20: 7 . . . . .	145*
		20: 8 . . . . .	266

## Index of Texts

*John*

	PAGE
20: 9 . . . . .	49, 265
20: 11 . . . . .	143
20: 12 . . . . .	116
20: 14 . . . . .	146
20: 17 . . . . .	63, 69, 127, 146*
20: 19 . . . . .	143
20: 21 . . . . .	298
20: 22 . . . . .	151, 174
20: 23 . . . . .	298
20: 26 . . . . .	42, 143
20: 28 . . . . .	57, 101, 116
20: 29 . . . . .	140
20: 30 . . . . .	138
20: 31 . . . . .	244
21 . . . . .	143
21: 1 . . . . .	337
21: 15-17 . . . . .	276, 279,* 319
21: 19 . . . . .	61, 338
21: 22 . . . . .	326*

*Acts*

1: 4 . . . . .	158
1: 5, 8 . . . . .	307
1: 6 . . . . .	144
1: 11 . . . . .	328
1: 16 . . . . .	158
1: 20 . . . . .	49
1: 23-26 . . . . .	299
2: 17 . . . . .	329
2: 38 . . . . .	239
3: 13-15 . . . . .	179
4: 13 . . . . .	370
5: 3, 4 . . . . .	58
6 . . . . .	299
6: 14 . . . . .	34
7: 56 . . . . .	118, 147
7: 56, 59 . . . . .	338
9: 4 . . . . .	147
10 . . . . .	33
10: 26 . . . . .	123
10: 41 . . . . .	143
10: 43 . . . . .	172
10: 48 . . . . .	307
11: 17 . . . . .	319
14: 15 . . . . .	123
14: 17 . . . . .	21

*Acts*

	PAGE
15: 21 . . . . .	59
17: 22ff. . . . .	21
17: 24 . . . . .	58
17: 25 . . . . .	61
17: 28 . . . . .	61, 70
17: 31 . . . . .	346
23: 6 . . . . .	340
23: 9 . . . . .	30
23: 25 . . . . .	160*
24: 15 . . . . .	340
28: 25 . . . . .	158
28: 26 . . . . .	50, 218

*Romans*

1: 4 . . . . .	179
1: 20 . . . . .	80
1: 21 . . . . .	242
1: 24, 26, 28 . . . . .	50
1: 28 . . . . .	219
2: 6 . . . . .	351
2: 16 . . . . .	346
4: 3 . . . . .	249
4: 17 . . . . .	341
5 . . . . .	190
5: 5 . . . . .	169
5: 8, 10 . . . . .	281
6: 16 . . . . .	210
7 . . . . .	269
7: 17, 18 . . . . .	107, 190
8: 1 . . . . .	349
8: 2 . . . . .	223
8: 6 . . . . .	357
8: 10 . . . . .	255
8: 11 . . . . .	341
8: 23 . . . . .	174
8: 26 . . . . .	168
8: 26, 27 . . . . .	148
8: 29 . . . . .	111
8: 34 . . . . .	148
9: 5 . . . . .	57
9: 6 . . . . .	300
10: 9 . . . . .	239
10: 18 . . . . .	92
11: 29 . . . . .	337
13: 10 . . . . .	277
16: 20 . . . . .	198

# Index of Texts

397

<i>I. Corinthians</i>	PAGE	<i>Galatians</i>	PAGE
1: 9 . . . . .	282	1: 14 . . . . .	371
1: 14-17 . . . . .	307	2: 20 . . . . .	255
1: 21 . . . . .	241	3: 6 . . . . .	249
2: 10ff. . . . .	169	3: 28 . . . . .	103
3: 16, 17 . . . . .	254	3: 29 . . . . .	363
3: 17 . . . . .	32	4: 3, 9 . . . . .	29*
3: 21 . . . . .	265	4: 4 . . . . .	329
6: 3 . . . . .	345	4: 26 . . . . .	152
6: 19 . . . . .	32, 254	5: 13 . . . . .	282
7: 25 . . . . .	331		
8: 1, 2 . . . . .	242		
10: 4 . . . . .	91		
10: 9 . . . . .	91*		
11: 3 . . . . .	103		
11: 26 . . . . .	328		
12: 3 . . . . .	167, 319		
12: 12 . . . . .	313, 350		
13: 2 . . . . .	274		
13: 2, 8 . . . . .	242		
13: 3 . . . . .	276		
13: 12 . . . . .	169		
14: 21 . . . . .	23		
14: 24 . . . . .	177		
15: 1-4 . . . . .	376		
15: 8 . . . . .	372		
15: 12, 13 . . . . .	340		
15: 12-19 . . . . .	341		
15: 21, 22 . . . . .	340*		
15: 22 . . . . .	190		
15: 25, 36 . . . . .	341		
15: 46 . . . . .	72		
15: 50 . . . . .	357		
15: 51 . . . . .	146		
16: 22 . . . . .	278		
<i>II. Corinthians</i>			
3: 17 . . . . .	164		
3: 18 . . . . .	110		
4: 4 . . . . .	198		
4: 6 . . . . .	110, 111		
5: 10 . . . . .	343, 354		
5: 16 . . . . .	372		
11: 3 . . . . .	191		
12: 9, 10 . . . . .	261		
<i>Colossians</i>			
	1 . . . . .		375
	1: 15 . . . . .		111
	1: 15, 16 . . . . .		94
	1: 21 . . . . .		29
	1: 24 . . . . .		147
	1: 27 . . . . .		255
	2: 9 . . . . .		35

<i>Colossians</i>	<i>PAGE</i>	<i>Hebrews</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
2: 10 . . . . .	265	1: 2 . . . . .	III
2: 14 . . . . .	34	1: 3 . . . . .	94, 100
3: 3, 4 . . . . .	255	1: 8 . . . . .	57
3: 15 . . . . .	282	1: 14 . . . . .	117
		2: 9 . . . . .	103
		2: 14 . . . . .	179, 203
<i>I. Thessalonians</i>		3: 2, 5, 6 . . . . .	151, 152
2: 12 . . . . .	282	3: 7 . . . . .	158
4: 16 . . . . .	328	4: 12 . . . . .	86
5: 19 . . . . .	169	4: 15 . . . . .	147
		6 . . . . .	271
<i>II. Thessalonians</i>		7: 3 . . . . .	288
1: 7-10 . . . . .	203	7: 25 . . . . .	149
2: 7-9 . . . . .	203	9: 8 . . . . .	158
2: 10, 11 . . . . .	219	9: 27, 28 . . . . .	335
2: 13, 14 . . . . .	225	10: 15 . . . . .	158
		10: 21 . . . . .	151
<i>I. Timothy</i>		11: 6 . . . . .	258
1: 13 . . . . .	208	12: 5 . . . . .	177
1: 15 . . . . .	124	12: 22 . . . . .	152
2: 4 . . . . .	65, 231*	13: 14 . . . . .	152
2: 13, 14 . . . . .	191		
2: 15 . . . . .	255	<i>James</i>	
3: 1 . . . . .	302	1: 17 . . . . .	62, 70
3: 6 . . . . .	195*	1: 18 . . . . .	224
3: 15 . . . . .	151	1: 27 . . . . .	262
5: 20 . . . . .	176	2: 9 . . . . .	177
6: 12 . . . . .	282	2: 26 . . . . .	274
6: 16 . . . . .	156	4: 4 . . . . .	277, 280, 283
6: 19 . . . . .	222	5: 3 . . . . .	329
<i>II. Timothy</i>			
1: 9, 10 . . . . .	96	<i>I. Peter</i>	
1: 10 . . . . .	236	1: 5 . . . . .	329
3: 1 . . . . .	329	1: 11 . . . . .	158
3: 14 . . . . .	255	1: 12 . . . . .	173
4: 2 . . . . .	176	1: 15 . . . . .	282
		1: 20 . . . . .	96, 329
<i>Titus</i>		2: 5 . . . . .	32, 254
1: 9 . . . . .	177	2: 16 . . . . .	265
1: 13 . . . . .	176	4: 17 . . . . .	151
2: 13 . . . . .	57	5: 8 . . . . .	197
2: 14 . . . . .	263		
2: 15 . . . . .	176	<i>II. Peter</i>	
3: 5 . . . . .	239, 380	1: 1 . . . . .	57
		1: 3 . . . . .	169
		1: 4 . . . . .	237

# Index of Texts

399

<i>II. Peter</i>	<i>PAGE</i>	<i>I. John</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
1: 10 . . . . .	231	4: 1 . . . . .	350
1: 21 . . . . .	158	4: 2 . . . . .	325
2: 4 . . . . .	193,* 345	4: 2, 3 . . . . .	105, 171, 372
2: 19 . . . . .	210	4: 3 . . . . .	121,* 349, 350
3: 3 . . . . .	329	4: 7 . . . . .	242
3: 9 . . . . .	65, 66*	4: 8 . . . . .	61, 64,* 82
		4: 13 . . . . .	255
		4: 16 . . . . .	61, 64,* 246, 255
		4: 17 . . . . .	344
		4: 19 . . . . .	61, 245, 276
		4: 20 . . . . .	275
		5: 3 . . . . .	79, 82, 373
		5: 4 . . . . .	244
		5: 4, 5 . . . . .	283*
		5: 6-8 . . . . .	308*
		5: 7 . . . . .	160, 164
		5: 11 . . . . .	223, 353
		5: 11, 12 . . . . .	358
		5: 12 . . . . .	210
		5: 12, 13 . . . . .	223
		5: 16 . . . . .	149, 271*
		5: 16, 17 . . . . .	270*
		5: 18 . . . . .	267
		5: 18, 19 . . . . .	198
		5: 19 . . . . .	179, 216
		5: 19, 20 . . . . .	198
		5: 20 . . . . .	58, 61
		<i>II. John</i>	
			7 . 105, 325, 349, 372
		<i>III. John</i>	
		2 . . . . .	217
		11 . . . . .	352
		<i>Jude</i>	
		6 . . . . .	193,* 345
		15 . . . . .	177
		18 . . . . .	329
		21 . . . . .	255
		<i>Revelation</i>	
		1: 13 . . . . .	147, 347
		2: 5 . . . . .	337

## Index of Texts

<i>Revelation</i>	<i>PAGE</i>	<i>Revelation</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
2: 11 . . . . .	359	13: 6 . . . . .	110
2: 13 . . . . .	244	13: 8 . . . . .	96
2: 16 . . . . .	337	13: 10 . . . . .	244
2: 17 . . . . .	152	13: 11-18 . . . . .	350
2: 18 . . . . .	347	14: 12 . . . . .	244
2: 19 . . . . .	244	14: 14 . . . . .	347
2: 27 . . . . .	347	17: 16 . . . . .	105
3: 3 . . . . .	337	19: 8 . . . . .	353
3: 5 . . . . .	152, 347	19: 10 . . . . .	172
3: 12 . . . . .	347	19: 13 . . . . .	84
3: 14 . . . . .	94	19: 18, 21 . . . . .	105
3: 19 . . . . .	177	19: 20 . . . . .	350
3: 21 . . . . .	347	20: 2 . . . . .	198
4: 11 . . . . .	224	20: 4-6 . . . . .	342
5: 6 . . . . .	147	20: 6 . . . . .	359
5: 9-14 . . . . .	353	20: 12, 13 . . . . .	352
6: 16 . . . . .	65	21 . . . . .	152
7: 10 . . . . .	353	21: 3 . . . . .	110
7: 14 . . . . .	273, 353	21: 6 . . . . .	94
7: 15 . . . . .	110	21: 8 . . . . .	359
12: 9 . . . . .	198	22: 13 . . . . .	94
12: 10 . . . . .	197	22: 15 . . . . .	277
12: 12 . . . . .	110	22: 17 . . . . .	66*

# Index of Subjects and Authors

- ABBOT, EZRA, 101, 237.  
ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν, 277.  
ἀγάπη, 278.  
αἰτεῖν, 259.  
Ambrose, 104, 159.  
Angel of Jehovah, 88ff.  
Angels, 116ff.; judgment of, 345.  
Anselm, 192.  
Antichrist, 105, 349ff.  
Apocalypse, 342; date of, 382.  
Apostles, authority of, 297; inspiration of, 330.  
Aquinas, Thos., estimate of, 17; cited, 55, 80, 112, 115, 163, 165, 192, 196, 231, 278, 327.  
Aristotle, 18, 132, 133.  
Athenagoras, 196.  
Atonement, 231ff.  
Augustine, estimate of, 17ff.; cited, 32, 51, 55, 56, 65, 83, 90; on John 8: 25, 95; on John the Baptist and Jesus, 97ff.; cited, 101, 102, 104, 108, 121, 147; on the name *Holy Spirit*, 160; cited, 165, 184, 199, 201, 202, 209, 213, 216, 218, 226, 229, 234, 246, 252, 253, 274, 312, 325; on the millennium, 332.
- BACON, B. W., 374, 382.  
Bacon, Lord, 50, 132, 133, 182.  
Baptism, 238, 306ff.  
Barnabas, Epistle of, 118.
- Bengel, 82, 195, 309, 310.  
Beyschlag, W., 32, 98, 183, 270.  
Bigg, Charles, 249.  
βίος, 221.  
Bissell, E. C., 192.  
Boanerges, 12.  
Broadus, J. A., 198, 211, 328.  
Browne, Sir Thos., 99.  
Butler, Bishop, 154.
- CÆDMON, 195.  
Calvin, estimate of, 18; cited, 115, 172, 211, 225, 229, 271, 288, 296, 311.  
Campbell, Thos., 294.  
Cassian, 121.  
Cheyne, T. K., 185.  
Children, 204, 211, 213, 251.  
Church, nature of, 289ff.; organization, 296ff.; unity, 312ff.; extension, 319ff.  
Chrysostom, 93, 172, 237.  
Clarke, W. N., 115, 213, 328.  
Clement of Alexandria, 36, 196.  
Coleridge, 229.  
Comings of Christ (*a*) in the flesh, 325; (*b*) final, 326ff.; (*c*) in the Spirit, 335ff.  
Conversion, 240.  
Creationism, 213.  
Cunningham, Wm., 196, 290.  
Cyprian, 298.
- DALMAN, G., 73; on *Son of man*, 118; on *Son of God*, 126.

## 402 Index of Subjects and Authors

- Dante, 195.  
Death, 358.  
Depravity, total, 212.  
Delitzsch, F., 196, 270.  
Deissmann, G. A., 278.  
Dillmann, A., 196.
- ECCLESIASTICUS, 88, 195.  
Edersheim, A., 339.  
Edwards, Jonathan, 186, 187, 211, 229.  
*εἰδέναι*, 241.  
Election, 225ff.  
*ἐλεγχεῖν*, 176.  
Elicott, C. J., 232, 302, 341.  
Enoch, book of, 88, 193, 196.  
*ἔρωτᾶν*, 173, 259.  
Essenes, 192.
- FAITH, 244ff.  
Fall, the, 190ff.  
Farrar, F. W., 121.  
Flesh, the, 105.  
Friendship in N. T., 279.  
Future state, 356ff.
- GALILEE, ministry of Jesus in, 25; "his own country," 25.  
*γενώσκειν*, 241.  
Gnosticism, 92, 119, 184, 189, 372.  
God, unity of, 54; Trinity, 54;  
Spirit, 58ff.; in O. T., 60;  
attributes, 60ff.; light, 63;  
love, 64; Father, 68ff.;  
threefold Fatherhood (*a*) natural, 70, 200; (*b*) providential, 73; (*c*) gracious, 76; how revealed, 80.  
Godet, F., 15; estimate of, 17;  
cited, 181, 324, 331, 341, 368, 369.  
Gospels, main teaching of, 110.  
Gospels, synoptic, resemble John, 9; differ from John,
- 8, 14, 130, 167, 221, 223, 247, 253, 255, 319; vocabulary of, 380.  
Grotius, 13.
- HAMILTON, SIR WM., 267.  
Harnack, A., 382.  
Hastings' Bible Dictionary, 37, 89, 115, 118, 119, 168, 185, 190, 244, 296, 302, 324, 360, 363.  
Haupt, E., 121.  
Heathen, revelation to, 21; judgment of, 353.  
Heaven, 61, 152ff., 193.  
Hilary of Poitiers, 103.  
Hippolytus, 104.  
Hodge, A. A., 362.  
Hodge, Chas., 206; on the Church, 289, 315; 330; on the second coming of Christ, 333; on the number of the lost, 362.  
Holy Spirit, in O. T., 157ff.  
*Nature* (*a*) a Person, 158; (*b*) divine, 159; (*c*) distinct from Father and Son, 163; procession of, 164, 165.  
*Office*: (*a*) through Him the Word became flesh, 166; (*b*) by Him Jesus was anointed and led, 166; (*c*) completes the work of Jesus, (*a*) to believers, 168; recalls and interprets the teaching of Jesus, 170; completes the teaching of Jesus, 171. Applies benefits of redemption, 174; sanctifies, 174, 273. (*b*) to the world, 176ff. Regeneration of, 236.  
Hort, F. J. A., 37, 101, 289, 297, 302, 303.  
House of God, 151.
- IGNATIUS, 304.

- In my name*, 259.  
 Irenæus, 37, 121.  
 JESUS, how represented, 10, 11, 43, 252; words of, in the several Gospels, 14; length of ministry, 27, 36; attitude towards the law, 31, 35; fulfils prophecy, 42; recognized authority of O. T., 50; preexistence of, 96, 98; contrasted with John the Baptist, 97; without sin, 122; use of personal pronouns, 130; divinity of, how shown, 140; appearances after His resurrection, purpose of, 143; the judge of all, 346. See also under *Word*.
- Jews, people of God, 24; forfeited birthright, 28; use of term *the Jews*, 28; in what sense are, are not, children of God, 75; revelation to, 91.
- John, character, 12; contrasted with Paul (*a*) in temperament, 367; (*b*) in education, 370; (*c*) in religious experience, 372; teaching not appreciably affected by Paul's, 374; differences in their modes of presenting truth, with reference to the *Person of Christ*, 375, and the *Doctrine of Faith*, 378; John treats of truth in its essence and Paul in its application, 380; John regards the ideal and Paul the actual, 381.
- John, Gospel of, authorship, 7; trustworthiness, 8; character of, 22; relation to O. T., 22, 24; chronology of, 36; vocabulary of, 380.
- John of Damascus, 108, 164, 231.
- Johnson, Franklin, 50  
 Johnson, Herrick, 288.  
 Josephus, 192, 196, 197.  
 Judea, ministry of Jesus in, 25, 26.  
 Judgment, universal, 343; purpose of general, 344; committed to the Son, 346; rule of, the Word of God, 350; according to works, 351; final, 354.  
 Justify, justification, 379.  
 Justin Martyr, 44, 196.
- Káρπος*, 274.  
 Kellogg, S. H., 333.  
 Kingdom of God, 221.  
 Koran, 54.  
 Krüger, 382.  
 Kuyper, 115, 166.
- LACTANTIUS, 196.  
 Lampe, 203.  
 Lange, 335.  
 Law, moral and ceremonial, 31; opposed to grace, 53.  
 Lee, Wm., 334.  
 Lenormant, F., 196.  
 Life, meaning of, in Scripture, 357.  
 Lightfoot, J. B., 90, 94, 121, 221, 241, 265, 296, 297, 302, 304, 305, 326, 340.  
 Lord's Supper, 235, 308ff., 328.  
 Lowrie, Walter, 17.  
 Luther, 216.
- MANICHEANS, 199, 201.  
 Martensen, H., 115, 206.  
 Mary, mother of Jesus, relation to John, 13; part in the Gospel, 14.  
 McGiffert, A. C., 374, 382.  
 Methodius, 196.  
 Meyer, H. A. W., 17, 211, 341.  
 Milton, 195, 292.

## 404 Index of Subjects and Authors

- Miracles, number of, in Scripture, 137, and in the Gospels, 138; place and value of, 139.
- Morgan, G. Campbell, 333.
- NEW LIFE, the, in Christ alone, 252; sustained by faith and prayer, 258; characteristic features of (*a*) sanctification, 263; (*b*) service, 273; (*a*) to the brethren, 275; (*b*) to the world, 280.
- OEHLER, G. F., on sin, 186; on Satan, 193; 270, 340.
- Old Testament, relation to natural religion and to N. T., 22; authority of, 23, 46, 50; prophetic character, 42; citations from, in the Gospels, 47ff.; contrasted with N. T. in emphasis upon holiness and love, 64, 117, and upon sovereignty and fatherhood of God, 79; and in mode of revelation, 85; preparation for doctrine of the Logos, 85, 87ff.
- Origen, 36, 97, 108, 192.
- PARACLETE, 168.
- παρουσία*, 326.
- Particles, use of, by John and Paul, 368.
- Perseverance, final, 285.
- Pharisees, 30.
- Philo, doctrine of the Logos, 86; 192, 196, 278.
- Plato, 18, 86.
- Plummer, 340.
- Prayer, 258ff.
- Premillennialism, 331ff.
- Probation, twofold, 251.
- Prologue of Gospel, range of, 16; relation to the O. T., 89.
- Ptolemy, 132.
- Purves, G. T., 196.
- Pythagoras, 132.
- RAMSAY, W. M., 160, 382.
- Regeneration, 236.
- Resurrection, universal, 339; time of, 341.
- Riehm, E., 60, 69.
- Ritschl, 248.
- SABBATH, LAW OF, 39ff.
- Sadducees, 30.
- Salmond, S. D. F., 339, 354, 357.
- Salvation, is eternal life, 221; (*A*) part of God in. 1. Good pleasure of the Father, shown (1) in gift of His Son, 225; (2) in election of men, 225; (*a*) will of God not arbitrary, 226; (*b*) election to salvation involves election to service, 227; (*c*) election does not annul human freedom, 228. 2. Atonement of the Son, 231. 3. Regeneration of the Spirit, 236. (*B*) the part of man, (*a*) knowledge, 241; (*b*) repentance, 243; (*c*) faith, 244; condition of, faith manifested by works, 352.
- Sanctification through the Holy Spirit, 174, 273; nature of, 263ff.
- Sanday and Headlam, 191, 248, 277, 307.
- Satan, author of sin, 192; fall of, 193: caused fall of man, 196; names of, 197; destroyed by Christ, 202.
- Schaff, P., 306.
- Schultz, H., on sin, 186; on Satan, 193; names for sin in O. T., 206; original sin, 211; 270.

- Schürer, E., 339, 360.  
 Service of believers (*a*) to the brethren, 275; (*b*) to the world, 280.  
 Shakespeare, 195, 250.  
 Shedd, W. G. T., 161, 362.  
 Shekinah, 110.  
 Sin; *Origin* of, 183ff. (*1*) had a beginning, 184; (*2*) is a personal quality, 184; (*3*) is not of God, 185; (*4*) is of the creature, 187; (*5*) did not originate with man, 189; (*6*) began with Satan, 192. *Nature*. Names of, 206; is darkness, 209; bondage, 209; death, 210. Original sin, 212; is universal, 213, 215; how transmitted, 213. *Issue* of, 216ff., 361. In the life of the believer, 266ff.
- Smith, G. A., 31.  
 Smith and Wace, 304.  
 Smyth, Newman, 290.  
 Socrates, 132.  
 Socrates, Eccles. History, 121.  
 Son of God, 126ff.; Messianic title, 126.  
 Son of man, 118ff.; origin of title, 118; significance of: (*a*) Perfect man, 122; (*b*) Representative man, 124; Messianic title, 125; shall be the judge, 347.
- Stanley, A. P., 55.  
 Stevens, G. B., 17, 31, 259.  
 St. Patrick, 54.  
 Sulpitius Severus, 196.
- TEACHING OF JESUS**, marks of: (*a*) personal, 130; (*b*) comprehensive, 131; (*c*) certainty, 134; (*d*) life-giving, 136.  
 Temptation, 203.  
 Tertullian, 104, 121, 196.
- Testament of Twelve Patriarchs, 196.  
 Thayer's Lexicon, 86, 259.  
 Toy, C. H., 185.  
 Traducianism, 213.  
 Trench, R. C., 98, 206, 222, 259.  
 Trinity, 54.
- UNION OF BELIEVERS WITH CHRIST**, illustrated by figures of (*a*) shepherd and sheep, 256; (*b*) bread of life, 256; (*c*) vine and branches, 257; compared to union of Father and Son, 257.  
 Universalism, 359.
- VERILY, VERILY**, 135.  
 Vincent, M. R., 302.
- WARFIELD, B. B., 166, 190, 363.  
 Weiss, B., 31, 249, 377.  
 Wendt, H. H., 98.  
 Westcott, B. F., 17; on *the flesh*, 107; 115, 183, 213, 241.  
 Winer, G. B., 102, 232, 369.  
 Wisdom in the O. T., 87.  
 Wisdom, Book of, 88, 192, 197.  
 Word of God in O. T., 87.  
 Word, the, use of term, 84, 85; medium of all revelation, 89, 92; threefold revelation through: (*a*) to all men, 90; (*b*) to the Jews, 91; (*c*) in the flesh, 92; predicates of: *in the beginning*, 93; *with God*, 99; *was God*, 100; subordination to the Father, 102, 128, 165, 346; advent, manner, 105; purpose, 112; reveals God (*A*) in His Person, 115ff.; (*B*) in His Teaching, 130ff.; (*C*) in His Works, 137; heavenly ministry for His

## 406 Index of Subjects and Authors

disciples: (*a*) intercedes for them, 148; (*b*) answers their prayers, 149; (*c*) sends them the Holy Spirit, 150; (*d*) prepares a place for them, 151.

World, use of term, 215; 280, 320; relation of believers to, 281.

ZAHN, TH., 382.  
*ζωή* and *βίος*, 221.

123  
124





